DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 789 LI 004 142

AUTHOR Hamm, G. Paul
TITLE An Historical Survey of the Relation Among the Philosophy, Method, and Libraries of American Theological Education.
PUB DATE May 72
NOTE 185p.; (390 References); Doctoral Dissertation

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Educational Philosophy; Historical Reviews; Librarians; *Libraries; Library Science; Literary Analysis; Religious Education; Teaching Methods; *Theological Education
IDENTIFIERS *Library Role

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is the report of an analysis of the literature of American theological education. American theological education is defined here as the efforts of American Protestant theological schools, particularly the member schools of the American Association of Theological Schools (AATS), to prepare students for ministry. An assumption of this study is that the role of the library is crucial to the success of theological education. The study is not limited to, but is primarily concerned with, three interrelated dynamics: the philosophy, teaching method, and libraries of theological education. A basic assumption of the analysis is that these three dynamics exert a reciprocal influence upon each other. The purpose of the study is to trace the historical development of the theological library as it responded to and, in turn, stimulated the philosophy and teaching method of theological education, and from the observation of these reciprocal influences to understand and project the library's potential in contemporary theological education. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 072789

AN HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE RELATION AMONG THE PHILOSOPHY, METHOD, AND LIBRARIES OF AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Sacred Theology

---

by

G. Paul Hamm

May 1972

LI 004 142

TO JOYCE, *whose faith and love are a constant source of inspiration and strength*

TO KARYL, *who shares her father's love for books*

TO MARK, *whose patience has been severely tested, but who good-naturedly stood the test of my neglect*

TO JOHN, *whose four-year-old charm and enthusiasm have brightened some dreary moments*

TO MY PARENTS, *whose love and guidance led me to follow Christ*

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to the late Dr. Derward W. Deere, who encouraged me in graduate studies and in my choice of theological librarianship as a profession. The administration of Golden Gate Seminary has been supportive during the period of my graduate studies. Mrs. Judy Smith persevered in typing my notes and assisted in compiling the questionnaire. Mrs. Linda Rogers cheerfully typed many drafts of the manuscript. A special word of thanks is given to Joe and Virginia Willis, who rescued me from an impossible situation. Mrs. Jewell Carter's talent for securing inter-library loans was tested by my requests. Mrs. Julie Laws gave valuable assistance, especially with the bibliography. The entire library staff, especially Mike England, has been cooperative.

Dr. R. Vernon Ritter has been a most helpful mentor. He deserves the credit for any contribution this dissertation may make to theological education, without any blame for its shortcomings.

Mrs. Donald Forseth patiently edited and typed the final draft.

My deepest gratitude to my wife, without whose aid and encouragement this dissertation could not have been a reality.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Types of Libraries	125
2	The Function of the Library in Theological Education	126
3	The Relation of Media to the Library	130
4	Responsibility for Nonbook Media.	131
5	Persons to Whom Nonbook Media are Available	132
6	The Function of the Librarian in Theological Education	134
7	Responses to Yes-No Questions	138
8	Lines of Authority	141

GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iii
LIST OF TABLES		iv
Chapter		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	DEVELOPMENT OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN AMERICA, 1636-1918	5
	PRE-SEMINARY STAGE	5
	EARLY SEMINARY STAGE	7
	POST-CIVIL WAR STAGE	9
	SUMMARY	11
3	ESTABLISHMENT OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SUBSEQUENT SELF-ANALYSIS, 1918-1946	13
	SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS OF THIS PERIOD	13
	THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION	16
	THE TEACHING METHODS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION	19
	LIBRARIES	21
	SUMMARY	27
4	ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE LIBRARY'S ROLE, 1947-1960	30
	GROUNDWORK FOR THE DEVELOPMENTS OF THIS PERIOD	30
	THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION	34
	TEACHING METHOD OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION	38
	LIBRARIES	42
	SUMMARY	51
5	A DECADE OF PHYSICAL GROWTH, 1961-1971	53
	HIGHLIGHTS OF THE DEVELOPMENTS OF THIS PERIOD	53
	THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION	61
	TEACHING METHOD OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION	72
	LIBRARIES	78
	SUMMARY	87

6 CURRENT INFLUENCES ON THE PHILOSOPHY, TEACHING METHOD, AND LIBRARIES OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 89

INDIRECT INFLUENCES 90

INFLUENCES ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 94

INFLUENCES ON THEOLOGICAL TEACHING METHOD 103

INFLUENCES ON LIBRARIES 116

INFLUENCES ON LIBRARIANS 119

SUMMARY. 122

7 THE LIBRARY ROLE IN 1971: A SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATORS AND LIBRARIANS OF AATS 124

THE FUNCTION OF THE LIBRARY IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 125

THE FUNCTION OF THE LIBRARIAN IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 133

THE FUNCTION OF THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 143

SUMMARY. 144

8 CONCLUSION 146

APPENDIX: SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE 149

BIBLIOGRAPHY 153

ANALYTICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter

1 INTRODUCTION 1

2 DEVELOPMENT OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN AMERICA, 1636-1918. . . . 5

PRE-SEMINARY STAGE 5

Teaching Method 6

Libraries 7

EARLY SEMINARY STAGE 7

Teaching Method 8

Libraries 9

POST-CIVIL WAR STAGE 9

SUMMARY 11

3 ESTABLISHMENT OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SUBSEQUENT SELF-ANALYSIS, 1918-1946 13

SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS OF THIS PERIOD 13

The American Association of Theological Schools 14

Four Major Studies of Theological Education 14

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 16

According to Kelly. 16

According to the May Report 16

According to the Committee on the Curriculum 17

According to Hartshorne 18

THE TEACHING METHODS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 19

According to Kelly. 19

According to the May Report 20

According to Hartshorne 21

LIBRARIES 21

According to Kelly. 21

Page

Library Conditions in 1926. 22
According to the May Report 22
Overall view 23
Purpose 23
Use 23
Personnel 23
Financial support 24
Buildings 25
Statement of Middle States Association 25
The First Standards of Accrediting 25
Branscomb's Report 26
Statement in Southern Association Quarterly 26
According to Hartshorne 26
SUMMARY 27

4 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE LIBRARY'S ROLE, 1947-1960 30
GROUNDWORK FOR THE DEVELOPMENTS OF THIS PERIOD 30
The American Theological Library Association. 31
Preparatory influences. 31
First conference. 32
Influence of ATLA 32
The Niebuhr Report (1957) 32
THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 34
Critiques of Theological Education 34
Sherrill and Kuhlman. 34
Elliott 35
Trost 36
Morris 36
Tead 36
Bruner 36
According to the Niebuhr Report 37
TEACHING METHOD OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 38
Critiques of Teaching Method 38

Page

Elliott 39
Trost 39
Morris 39
Tead 39
According to the Niebuhr Report 40
The "didactic stance" 40
"Getting everything in" 41
The theological student 41
Results of content transmission 41
Elements of good theological teaching 42
LIBRARIES 42
Critiques of Libraries by Theological Educators 42
Sherri[illegible] 43
Kuhlman 43
Elliott 43
Trost 43
Morris 43
Roberts 43
Niebuhr 44
Revised Library Standards 44
The ideal library 44
The library committee 45
Library personnel, etc. 45
According to the Niebuhr Report 45
Expenditures 46
Librarians 46
Buildings and equipment 48
Lilly Scholarship Fund Established (1958) 48
New Library Standards (1958) 49
Beach's Evaluation (1960) 50
SUMMARY 51

5 A DECADE OF PHYSICAL GROWTH, 1961-1971 53
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE DEVELOPMENTS OF THIS PERIOD 53
The Library Development Program (1961-1966) 53

Page

Critiques of Theological Education. 55
Consultation on Professional Education 57
Reforms in Higher Education vis-à-vis Theological Education 59
AATS Actions 60
THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 61
Critiques of Theological Education 61
Miller. 61
Alexander 63
Coburn and Boyd 65
Howe 65
Feilding 66
Pusey and Taylor 67
Bennett and Golterman 67
Shaull 68
Klemt 69
Kerr 70
A Shift in Emphasis 70
Proposed AATS Standards 71
Facilitation of student learning 71
Competence in bibliographic skills 71
TEACHING METHOD OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 72
Critiques of Teaching Method. 72
Howe 72
Feilding 72
Pusey and Taylor 73
Bennett 74
Deering 74
Seely 74
Shaull 75
Klemt 76
Leuba 76
Kerr 76
Proposed AATS Standards 76

Page

LIBRARIES 78
Library Development Program 78
Salaries and Status 79
Amendment to Library Standards 81
Mid-1960 Trends 81
Polarization of Theological Educators 82
Actions of AATS 85
SUMMARY 87

6 CURRENT INFLUENCES ON THE PHILOSOPHY, TEACHING METHOD, AND LIBRARIES OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 89
INDIRECT INFLUENCES 90
Decelerating Growth in Student Enrollments 91
General Abandonment of Highly Selective Admission Standards 91
Rededication of the Educational Profession to Teaching . . . 92
Growing Acceptance of Continuing Education as a Norm 92
Decrease in Financial Support 93
INFLUENCES ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 94
Challenge of Educational "Myths" 94
The equation of education (learning) with schooling 94
The equation of teaching intent with learning 95
The designation of audio-visuals as "aids" 95
The Emergence of Viable Alternatives to the Traditional Educational Approach 96
Two types of learning 96
Two possible aims for education 96
Two sets of assumptions in education 97
The Trend Toward Individualization of Learning 98
Importance of individual differences 98
Use of nonbook media. 99
Facilitation of self-learning 99
The Proliferation and Growing Importance of Nonbook Media . . 100
Roles of nonbook media. 101
Advantages of nonbook media 102
Risks of nonbook media use 102

Page

INFLUENCES ON THEOLOGICAL TEACHING METHOD 103
Research on Dispensing Learning Content 103
Research Affecting the Teacher 105
Changing role of the teacher 105
Other methods as effective as the live lecture 106
Need to utilize multimedia in teaching 107
The New Type of Student 108
Uncertain commitment. 109
New conceptions of ministry, theology, and education. . . . 109
Sensory, audio-visual 110
Alienated 111
Quality-seeking 111
Subjective 111
Opposed to the traditional process of education 112
Learner Characteristics 112
New patterns of learning 112
Overdeveloped sensory appetite 113
New type of intelligence. 114
Research on Accelerating Learning 114
New Definitions of Aptitude 115
INFLUENCES ON LIBRARIES 116
A Role Change 116
Increased Usage and Importance 117
Part of a Network or System 117
A Center for Educational Resources 117
An Active, Aggressive Partner in Education 118
Library-Seminary? 119
INFLUENCES ON LIBRARIANS 119
A Prevalent View of the Librarian 120
The New Role of the Librarian 120
Counselor to teachers and students 120
Manager and producer of educational resources 121
An educator 121
SUMMARY 122

Page

7 THE LIBRARY ROLE IN 1971: A SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATORS AND LIBRARIANS OF AATS. 124

THE FUNCTION OF THE LIBRARY IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 125

According to Administrative Personnel 126

According to Librarians 128

In Relation to Nonbook Media 130

THE FUNCTION OF THE LIBRARIAN IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION. 133

According to Administrative Personnel 134

According to Librarians 136

As Indicated in Institutional Relationships 137

As Reflected by the Professional Background and Training of Librarians 142

THE FUNCTION OF THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 143

According to Administrative Personnel 143

According to Librarians 144

SUMMARY 144

8 CONCLUSION 146

APPENDIX: SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE 149

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 153

1 Monographs 153

2 Serials 160

3 Unpublished works 172

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There seems to be a general consensus among most librarians, faculty members, and administrators that the library is necessary for effective education. However, there is less agreement among, or even within, these groups as to the exact role of the library. There are two extremes in college ranks today. The library-collegians insist that instruction should revolve around or evolve from the library. Others regard the library as a resource, roughly equated with the classroom, that is very expensive and of doubtful worth, but must be tolerated because of the insistence of accrediting associations.[1]

An assumption of this study is that the role of the library is crucial to the success of theological education. An understanding of this role is every bit as crucial. This is as true of theological education as any other phase of education. Theological faculties, administrators, and librarians need a common understanding and agreement concerning the relation of the library to the overall purposes of theological schools. This is perhaps the most important need of the library, and of all theological education.

A question that perhaps should precede a study of the library's role and importance is: "What makes a library--what forces demand its existence and encourage its growth?" The library mirrors a complex of phenomena. Perhaps the most formative influence is the teaching approach of the faculty. For instance, a library is unnecessary in an educational process that makes the student responsible only for the teacher's lectures and the textbook. The educational philosophy of the school is perhaps the second most important influence. The allocations budgeted for the library, the buildings that house it, and the concept of the library

---

[1]"Basic Concepts of the Role of the Library in College Instruction," *Drexel Library Quarterly*, 7:173, July and October, 1971.

held by administrators and librarians are factors that affect the influence of the library. The librarian's training, status, and relationship to the educational process directly influence the quality of the library. The clientele of the library, including the administrators, faculty, staff, and students, are potent influences; conversely, they are affected by the library in varying degrees.

There are a number of influential forces outside the institution. Professional organizations, such as the American Association of Theological Schools and the American Theological Library Association, hereafter referred to as AATS and ATLA respectively, influence the institution as a whole and the library in particular. The literature of education and librarianship reflect and influence the library's role. Surveys of education, scholarly monographs, addresses to professional organizations, articles in journals of educations, etc., all exert formative influence. An understanding of these forces and how they affect the library should facilitate the growth and effectiveness of libraries.

This dissertation is the report of an analysis of the literature of American theological education. "American theological education" is defined here as the efforts of American Protestant theological schools, particularly the member schools of AATS, to prepare students for ministry. The study is not limited to, but is primarily concerned with, three interrelated dynamics: the philosophy, teaching method, and libraries of theological education. A basic assumption of the analysis is that these three dynamics exert a reciprocal influence upon each other. The purpose of the study is to trace the historical development of the theological library as it responded to and, in turn, stimulated the philosophy and teaching method of theological education, and from the observation of these reciprocal influences to understand and project the library's potential in contemporary theological education.

A careful study is made of the literature of theological education, such as studies, scholarly monographs, and bulletins of AATS and ATLA, as well as library literature at large. The specific question is: "What is the nature and scope of the reciprocal influence of the philosophy, teaching method, and libraries in theological education?" Available evidence has consisted primarily of scholarly studies and critiques of theological education by theological educators.

The philosophy of theological education is defined as the aims and objectives of theological education, as well as their rationale. Teaching method, as defined here, includes all efforts that implement these aims and objectives, whether inside or outside the classroom.

Carroll[2] listed four basic goals of theological education: (1) mastery of the Christian tradition, (2) practical competence, (3) spiritual formation, and (4) secular awareness.[3] He contended that these have been the goals of theological education throughout its history.

The point of this present study is that a variety of teaching methods could be utilized to achieve *any* of these goals, and these might, or might not, affect the library. The same is true of the academic and professional approaches to theological education. Both could be content-centered and confined largely to the classroom. On the other hand, a number of other methods could be used. The academic approach could consist of a professor pouring passive students full of scholarly facts and the professional could consist of a professor providing students with a bag of tricks that would equip them to minister. Neither one would have much influence upon the library, nor would the library have any significant reciprocal influence.

The term "role of the library" used in this study simply means the characteristic function assigned the library in the achievement of education. The library is seen as a learning resources center--a "knowledge bank" outside the classroom to facilitate learning. These resources include any media: books, films, filmstrips, video-tapes, slides, microfilm, realia, or any other entity that can be stored and retrieved to assist the learning process.

A basic assumption is that the library primarily collects printed material, although emphasis is given in this paper to nonbook media because of their proliferation and the reluctance in many areas of education to accept their worth or utilize them. However, the *book* is,

---

[2]For an historical overview of these goals, see Jackson Walker Carroll, "Seminaries and Seminarians: a Study of the Professionalization of Protestant Clergymen" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1970), pp. 49-81.

[3]Carroll, p. 10.

and will continue to be for a long time to come, the primary resource stored and retrieved by the library.

The method employed in this dissertation has been to compile the available resource material on these dynamics: philosophy, teaching method, and the library. The evidence was then grouped in logical divisions in a way intended to indicate their reciprocal influences, along with other pertinent forces, with special emphasis on library developments.

The first division was the period from the inception of theological education in America in 1636 (the founding of Harvard) to the establishment of AATS in 1918. Much of the evidence is general in nature, due to the embryonic development of theological education in this period; thus a study of the period yields only general results. The second division covered the period between the establishment of AATS in 1918 and the establishment of ATLA in 1947. The third division covered the period from 1947 through 1960, prior to the decade of great physical growth of theological libraries, which constitutes the fourth period, 1961-1971.

Although theological education is said to lag one hundred years behind secular education in its development, it nevertheless is affected by educational developments outside the field. A survey was made of the current developments in these areas; the results are reported in Chapter 6.

To assess the present role of the theological library as conceived by those responsible for it, a questionnaire was distributed to administrative personnel and librarians of AATS schools. The results are reported in Chapter 7.

Resource materials were arranged to form a composite picture of each period. At the risk of repetition, the material on each period is grouped around the three dynamics, following an historical introduction to the period. The scholars were allowed to speak for themselves, when possible, to bring the full weight of evidence to bear on each period, even though their findings often repeat those from previous periods. This failure to learn from the past may in itself give significance to the study, and the unheeded counsel of earlier scholars may provide a relevant thesis for a new period in theological education.

CHAPTER II

DEVELOPMENT OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN AMERICA, 1636-1918

The first period in the history of theological education in America spans 282 years. It began with the founding of Harvard University in 1636--the beginning of higher education on the American continent--and ended with the formation of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, predecessor of AATS.

PRE-SEMINARY STAGE

Originally ministers in America were trained in England at Oxford or Cambridge.[1] When it became impossible to supply the demand for adequately trained ministers in that manner, the desire for a worthy ministry for themselves and subsequent generations stimulated American Protestant churchmen to establish colleges.[2] "Of all the traditions brought by Protestant churchmen to America in the seventeenth century, none was more indispensible than the insistence on a learned ministry."[3] An educated ministry not only provided leadership in the new homeland but was a safeguard against heresy and fanaticism. The curricula of the early colonial colleges were constructed from a central theological perspective.[4] Postgraduate education in the first part of the eighteenth

---

[1]C. C. Goen, "Changing Conceptions of Protestant Theological Education in America," *Foundations*, 6:294, January, 1963. Goen was Associate Professor of Church History at Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C.

[2]Robert L. Kelly, *Theological Education in America: a Study of 161 Theological Schools in the United States and Canada* (New York: Doran, 1924), p. 23. Kelly was the Executive Secretary of the Council of Church Boards of Education.

[3]Goen, pp. 293-294.

[4]Goen, p. 294.

century was tutorial with pastors opening their parsonages and libraries to ministerial candidates.

Teaching Method

A young man would study in the home of an experienced pastor, serving a kind of apprenticeship. Though this was not a new method, it took on major importance during the eighteenth century. It received a great deal of impetus from the Great Awakening.[5] Rockwell described this process:

> A successful pastor would take one or two young men into his home, perhaps as boarders, supervise and discuss their reading, debate theological problems with them, and see to it that each one received diversified practice in such church duties as could be performed by an unordained man.[6]

Goen said:

> The method of instruction in household schools was that of directed reading, lecture, discussion, debate and writing, along with frequent opportunities for practice in preaching and pastoral ministry.[7]

By the middle of the eighteenth century, this "field education" approach to ministerial training had developed in a more formal manner. Some pastors turned their homes into "schools of the prophets" where small groups of ministerial candidates were guided in scholarly religious study in addition to practical instruction. Goed said:

> Although its spontaneous nature precluded closely controlled standards, and there was little uniformity in the content and method of the courses offered in household schools, in some instances a fair degree of institutional life developed. Here and there a ministerial tutor guided a stable group of scholars through a prescribed course, ofttimes in a crude building erected for the purpose. These "log colleges" stand somewhere between the household school of a pastor-tutor and the full grown seminary with its faculty of specialists.[8]

---

[5]Goen, p. 297; Robert G. Torbet, "Baptist Theological Education: an Historical Survey," *Foundations*, 6:311, January, 1963. Torbet was Dean and Professor of Church History at Central Baptist Theological Seminary.

[6]William Walker Rockwell, "Theological Libraries in the United States," *Religion in Life*, 13:545, Autumn, 1944. Rockwell was Librarian Emeritus, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

[7]Goen, p. 297.

[8]Goen, p. 298.

Libraries

The libraries of the period were small. The oldest academic library in America, at Harvard, began in 1638 when John Harvard donated about four-hundred volumes to the college.[9] By 1723, it had grown to 3,517 volumes of which nearly 60 percent were theological.[10] The library of Yale College was begun in 1701 when a group of ministers met in Branford, Connecticut, and each donated one book from his own library as a nucleus.[11] The entire library of the Revered Asa Burton (1752-1836), a Congregational minister in Thetford, Vermont, who trained about sixty men, is said to have stood on one long shelf.[12]

EARLY SEMINARY STAGE

The way was prepared for the theological seminary by the "transitional system under which a small denomination appointed one minister as its sole approved tutor." An example was the Dutch Reformed group in New York in their appointment of the Reverend John H. Livingston.[13]

Various developments influenced the establishment of seminaries. The spread of general education and the rise of rationalism resulted in an increased secularization of collegiate education. There was an increasing need for a definite apologetic; theological controversy created a desire for doctrinal soundness. A growth in denominational consciousness resulted in a desire to promote denominational loyalty by insuring that the prospective minister should be educated in an atmosphere congenail to the communion in which he was to work. The complexity of life, the challenge of the expanding West, and the upsurge of foreign missionary concern

---

[9]Warren R. Mehl, "The Protestant Theological Library in America. Past, Present, and Future," *Theology and Life*, 7:230, Fall, 1964. Mehl is Librarian, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[10]Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Puritan Pronaos* (New York: New York University Press, 1936), pp. 142-143.

[11]Rockwell, p. 547.

[12]Rockwell, p. 547.

[13]Rockwell, p. 545.

demanded more adequately trained professional leadership.[14] One scholar indicated that "the primary motive for the earliest establishment [of seminaries] was the desire to perpetuate some distinctive type of theological thought or ecclesiastical organization."[15]

The Dutch Reformed school under Livingston was established in 1774, and a Presbyterian seminary in western Pennsylvania in 1794. There followed a very rapid proliferation of denominational theological schools. By the time of the first comprehensive study of ministerial education in 1924, there were 161 schools which were designated as theological by their supporting constituencies in the United States and Canada.[16] These included Moravian, Reformed Presbyterian, Presbyterian, Congregational, Lutheran, Protestant Episcopal, and Baptist seminaries.

Teaching Method

According to Goen, Andover Seminary, founded in 1808, set the pattern for postgraduate professional theological schools in America in the first half of the nineteenth century. Its three-year curriculum was expanded and formalized far beyond the household schools.

> Both course content and the teaching method were based on the post-Reformation concept of Christianity as a body of divine truth to be preserved, defended and propagated by every effective means . . . most subjects were presented as materials for mastery rather than as opportunities for research.[17]

The seminary of this period offered no electives. Students were trained to be biblical critics, defenders of the faith, useful preachers, faithful

---

[14]William Adams Brown, *Ministerial Education in America: Summary and Interpretation*, Vol. I, *The Education of American Ministers*, ed. Mark A. May (New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934), p. 78; Torbet, p. 315; Goen, pp. 30-31. Brown was Professor of Applied Psychology at Union Theological Seminary in New York.

[15]S. J. Case, "Report of the Committee on the Curriculum," *Bulletin 13*, AATS, p. 67. Case was Dean of the University of Chicago Divinity School.

[16]Robert F. Beach, "Protestant Theological Seminaries and Their Libraries," *Library Trends*, 2:131-32, October, 1960. Beach is librarian at Union Theological Seminary in New York.

[17]Goen, p. 302.

pastors and responsible, consecrated churchmen who directed the activities of the visible church.[18]

The period around 1869 has been described:

> This rapid multiplication of institutions was accompanied, unfortunately, by no corresponding improvement in the character of the education they furnished. On the contrary, taking the period as a whole, it was characterized by a progressive decline of educational standards all along the line; and this decline was reflected in the institutions devoted to the training for the ministry.[19]

Libraries

The libraries established to support these institutions were as impoverished as the schools. Raymond Morris sketched the library situation:

> The first half of the nineteenth century was a period of establishment. The Library accumulations were limited, and their administration most simple. The period from 1850 to 1876 saw a small increase in the size and appropriations for support. In several southern and border states the Civil War retarded natural development of libraries.[20]

POST-CIVIL WAR STAGE

The rapid expansion of the new nation produced pioneer conditions in which small congregations "grew up whose ties with the central organizations were loose and who were content with the service of a ministry but little better educated than themselves." The Civil War had divided many of the strongest denominations and the responsibility for educating the ministry fell upon groups that were not only financially impoverished, but divided by misunderstanding and bitterness brought about by four years of war.[21]

---

[18]Goen, p. 302.

[19]Brown, p. 80.

[20]Mehl, p. 231, citing Raymond P. Morris, "A Study of the Library Facilities of a Group of Representative Protestant Theological Seminaries in the United States and Canada" (unpublished Master's thesis, School of Library Service, Columbia University, 1932), p. 21.

[21]Brown, pp. 80-81.

The period following the Civil War was characterized by sweeping societal changes, industrialization, and a phenomenal rise in the population of American cities due to immigration. Many factors had an impact on American church life: evolutionary philosophy, the historical and rational criticism of the Bible, the growing respect for science and the scientific method which dominated religious thought, increased social concern, and a new generation of religious speakers of liberal persuasion. Under the impact of these changes, churches redefined their concept of ministry and seminaries reconstructed their curricula. Goen stated "the old programs for professional training of ministers grandually gave way to new ways of preparing men for multiple ministries in a complex society."[22]

Despite attempts "to adapt the seminary curriculum and methods of teaching" to more nearly approximate the educational changes in the colleges and universities, and the desire to adapt the educational process to prepare students for specific ministerial tasks,[23] progress was slow. William Adams Brown said of the period:

> During the first part of the period under review progress was comparatively slow, and consisted rather in the raising of standards of admission and the improvement of teaching methods in certain seminaries than in any radical modification of the curriculum or procedure of the seminaries as a class. As we approach the close of the century, however, we find evidence of increased intellectual activity. This takes the form in some of the larger seminaries of a rapid increase in the number of subjects offered and an increasing freedom of election.[24]

Changes were neither easy nor rapid, nor did they come from within the seminaries themselves. Case stated that the newer demands upon the Christian ministry, those that affect training for it, are more quickly perceived by those who are nearest the front line of action. The seminary teacher is limited in his perspective from receiving first-hand contact with new practical problems. He said:

> Rarely does the cycle of birth and death operate with sufficient rapidity to keep the membership of a seminary faculty thoroughly up to date on the issues of most immediate concern to local churches

---

[22]Goen, p. 303.

[23]Brown, p. 82.

[24]Brown, p. 82.

> and communities. Yet the fact that the seminaries exert a conserving and stabilizing influence on the educational process is something for which we should probably be devoutly grateful. The great danger is that habitual procedures within the seminary grow into encrusted privileges whose shell cannot be broken.[25]

This lack of proper sensitivity to the need for revising educational objectives and methods to meet the changing demands on the Christian ministry has been the focus of criticism of theological education throughout most of the twentieth century.

SUMMARY

Only general conclusions can be drawn concerning the reciprocal influences of philosophy, method, and libraries of theological education during this period. Data on theological education are sparse owing to the lack of homogeneity of theological schools.

One could not assume that the "field education" approach of the pre-seminary stage was due to small libraries, or that more library research would have been required in the curricula of the "schools of the prophets" if an ample supply of books had been available. The magnitude of the need for trained ministers and the scarcity of research material necessitated a knowledge-transmission, content-centered approach to ministerial training.

Seminaries proliferated between the last quarter of the eighteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth. The rapid growth was not accompanied by educational improvement. The seminary of the first half of the nineteenth century concentrated on the mastery of truth rather than research. Few learning resources were needed, and the libraries were small.

Theological education, though weakened by the Civil War, rapid national expansion, and the low expectations of the pioneer churches, experienced some momentous changes during the second half of the nineteenth century. Theological schools raised their standards of admission,

---

[25]Case, p. 69.

improved teaching methods, and sought to adapt to the needs of the day. However, the curricula and procedures of the schools as a whole were little changed, imposing little strain on the libraries which were small, poorly administered, and inadequately supported.

Further change was effected in the educational process of the schools in the latter part of the nineteenth century as more subjects were offered and students were allowed more personal choice of courses. Theological libraries during this period were obviously the product and reflection of the educational process in which they existed and no doubt were appropriate to the educational philosophy and method of the period. The scarcity of books in the early part of the period made extensive use of learning resources outside the classroom impossible, and theological libraries exerted little or no influence on the educational process. Any influence upon libraries by the philosophy and method of theological education was primarily negative.

CHAPTER III

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SUBSEQUENT SELF-ANALYSIS (1918-1946)

Before the twentieth century, the growth of theological schools and their libraries was embryonic; it was influenced by the church and society more than by forces within theological education itself. With the establishment of AATS, these schools became part of a corporate group, an entity that could examine and evaluate itself.

The words "study" and "evaluation" characterize theological education during this period. Beginning in 1924, a study of theological education--its goals, aims, and procedures--was made every decade. Although each of these studies delineated the weaknesses of the philosophy and method of teaching, they paid little attention to the libraries. They showed the impoverishment of the library, but prescribed few formulas for the cure of its ills.

SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS OF THIS PERIOD

The establishment of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, predecessor of AATS, may have been the most important event in the history of theological education in America. The first comprehensive study of theological education, by Robert L. Kelly, was published in 1924. A massive four-volume work published in 1934 under the editorship of Mark A. May was very influential. The first accrediting standards for libraries were approved by AATS in 1936. The Association of American Colleges was surveyed and the results reported in *Teaching with Books*, by Harvie Branscomb, Dean of the Divinity School at Duke University. It was a most influential book on the proper role of the library in academia. A 1945 study of theological seminaries in the Northern Baptist Convention contributed to the entire field of

theological education. All these developments laid a foundation for a national organization of theological librarians.

The American Association of Theological Schools

The Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada was established in 1918 at Harvard University. In 1938, the name was changed to the American Association of Theological Schools. It is difficult to overstate the importance of AATS in the history of American theological education. Robert F. Beach, librarian of Union Theological Seminary, New York, said that "from its founding, the AATS has served as the key agency in the encouragement and coordination of graduate Protestant seminary education."[1] He further stated:

> Working through standing committees, especially appointed commissions, an executive director, a national headquarters office and supporting staff, etc., it has invited constructive explorations of new approaches, secured and administered large foundation grants, inaugurated comprehensive surveys of theological education (i.e. 1930-32, 1954-55), served as the official accrediting agency in the field of the graduate theological seminary, and performed other significant tasks.[2]

Particularly significant is the contention of Calvin Klemt, Librarian of Austin Presbyterian Seminary, that the history of AATS has been characterized by movement away from content-centered, instructional education toward education programmed for discovery.[3]

Four Major Studies of Theological Education

Between 1924 and 1945 there were four major studies of theological education. In 1924, Robert Lincoln Kelly, Executive Secretary of the Church Boards of Education, New York, published *Theological Education in America*, a comprehensive survey of 161 theological schools in the United States and Canada. The preface of this work indicated it was the result of widespread concern about the inadequacy of Protestant ministerial

---

[1]Beach, p. 136.

[2]Beach, p. 136.

[3]Calvin C. Klemt, "AATS, Educational Techniques, and Seminary Libraries," *Theological Education*, 5:357-364, Summer, 1969.

education. The churches faced a crisis in leadership because there were fewer and less capable ministerial candidates. There were many opinions and diagnoses of the problem and prescriptions for its cure, but these were not based on a careful study of the seminaries. This study was made to learn the facts and find a solution.[4] The study will be analyzed to reveal the theory, teaching method, and library conditions at that time.

In 1934 a four-volume work entitled *The Education of American Ministers* was published under the joint auspices of the Conference of Theological Seminaries in the United States and Canada and the Institute of Social and Religious Research. Mark A. May, Director of the School of Education at Yale University, was the major author, and William Adams Brown of Union Theological Seminary in New York was the theological consultant and author of the summary volume. This massive study exerted a great influence on contemporary thinking about theological education and had some far-reaching effects. It was responsible for the 1938 reorganization of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges of the United States and Canada.[5]

There was a realization that many of the major issues raised by the May report could not be met quickly, but called for prolonged and cooperative procedure. Therefore, at the ninth biennial meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in Rochester, New York in June of 1934 the Committee on Business and Findings recommended the appointment by the Executive Committee of a Commission on Accrediting Institutions of Theological Education.[6] Their report in 1936 included the first theological library standards.

A study of the seminaries of the Northern Baptist Convention by Hugh Hartshorne, Director of the Commission on the Survey of Theological Education, the Northern Baptist Convention, assisted by Milton C. Froyd, was published in 1945. Although limited to one particular denomination, the report had valuable insights and implications for theological education in general.

---

[4]Kelly, p. vii.

[5]L. R. Elliott, "'Hitherto. . .' Six Years of ATLA," *Summary of Proceedings*, Seventh Annual Conference, ATLA, 1953, p. 2.

[6]AATS, *Bulletin* 9, 1934, p. 16.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

These four studies questioned whether the word "education" applied to theological seminaries. Current educational theory was not utilized; the process was content-centered and lecture-dominated. The report of the Committee on the Curriculum analyzed two trends in the curriculum and called for education centered in problem-solving.

According to Kelly

The Kelly study stated that "there is no particular in which the traditional isolation of the seminary displays itself more strikingly than in the field of education" and that "many seminaries could scarcely qualify as educational institutions" because neither the language nor methods of modern education were employed.[7] The seminaries had failed to apply modern educational theory to religion

> . . . in interpreting from a Christian standpoint the modern problems of democracy, in working out a metaphysics in the light of the startling developments of the day in the various phases of science.[8]

According to the May Report

The portion of the May report that is most relevant to this study is chapter nine of volume three. This chapter is a condensed edition of a master's thesis written in 1932 by Raymond P. Morris while he was assistant librarian at Yale and studying library science at Columbia University. This work, a report of a research survey of the status and function of seventy-eight Protestant seminary libraries in the United States and Canada, has become a classic in the history of theological librarianship.

Morris stated that the educational philosophy of a particular institution has a vital effect on the financial support given the theological library. If the educational philosophy is content-centered and based on the lecture and textbook, then the demands upon the library will be very limited. However, if theological education involves research,

---

[7]Kelly, p. 228.

[8]Kelly, p. 45.

the demands upon the library will be increased. Mr. Morris stated that "adequate support for the library is dependent not upon students enrolled or on operating expenses of the institution, but upon the subjects offered in the curriculum."[9]

According to Morris, the prevailing atmosphere of the theological library was "that of an institution whose spirit, development, subjects emphasized, management and activity have lost touch with the educational stress and development" that were prominent in college and university libraries. The lack of coordination among the curriculum, the classroom, and the library was claimed as the chief defect in the seminary library.[10]

According to the Committee on the Curriculum

The 1938 report of the Committee on the Curriculum to AATS indicated that there were two curricular tendencies in theological education. Both were inadequate and needed to be supplanted by an approach that sought to educate the student in problem-solving. The report termed one tendency information-centered. This approach resulted in an effort "to cram the student full of information, particularly about the Bible." At the opposite extreme was the job-centered tendency, in which

> . . . the faculty seeks to anticipate every type of activity in which the prospective minister will find himself engaged and to provide him with a full equipment of tools and skills for the successful pursuit of his calling. It might almost be said that the seminary graduate is sent forth with a well stocked bag of tricks that are assumed to be adequate for any emergency.[11]

The report stated that the information-centered approach failed because, according to the testimony of recent seminary graduates, the minute knowledge acquired was irrelevant and inadequate when the minister was "faced with the concrete task of meeting the members of his congregation on the level of their most vital problems of living the religious life under the conditions of a present day world."[12] The job-centered

---

[9]Raymond P. Morris, "The Libraries of Theological Seminaries," *The Education of American Ministers*, ed. Mark A. May, Vol. III (New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934), p. 181.

[10]Morris, p. 189; May, p. 508.

[11]Case, pp. 72-73; see 71-76. [12]Case, p. 72.

approach failed because it had a deadening effect and not even the wisest professor was able to anticipate all the future contingencies that would face the student preparing for ministry. The report contended that neither curriculum approach supplied the dynamics to "stimulate creative self-reliance on the part of the student, render him socially minded, and make him personally adaptable to people and problems."[13]

The implication of the report was that, though the student should acquire both information and skills, his seminary training should be but a beginning of his educational experience. Rather than equipping the student with formulas for the solution of problems, he needed to be equipped to be a problem-solving individual. After stating that provision for

> . . . both breadth and depth in the now widely diversified activities of the ministerial profession, and how to make the training contribute directly toward actual efficiency in the modern world, is the concrete problem which curriculum revision should strive to solve . . . .[14]

The report described an experiment aimed at delivering students from the "lock step of the old educational chain gang," allowing him to participate in shaping his educational program, and aiding him to become a life-long learner.[15]

<u>According to Hartshorne</u>

The study by Hartshorne showed that seminary graudates regarded their seminary training as having little relevance to what was most important to their ministries. The overall impression reported by the authors was that a great deal of erudition was expressed by the faculty, but not much attention was paid to the abilities of the students or their needs as future ministers. There was much of importance in the process, but there was an imbalance of subject matter. Although the seminaries stated that their aims were to equip the student with a working knowledge of the need and possibilities of human nature and how it changes, of the social

---

[13]Case, p. 73.

[14]Case, p. 75.

[15]Case, pp. 75-76.

trends and movements of the day, and the special abilities needed for his ministry, these aims were being neglected.[16]

THE TEACHING METHODS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

The lecture and textbook dominated the teaching process of the period, inhibiting creativity and innovation in the classroom. Theological teachers lacked proper training in teaching methods. One scholar at least recognized the relationship of these conditions to the library.

According to Kelly

Kelly saw a definite connection between the library and the teaching method in the seminary. In his assessment of the lecture method he referred to the conditions and use of the libraries as confirmation of his contentions.[17] Two methods of teaching predominated, the lecture method and the textbook. The Kelly report indicated that, though there is justification for using these methods, the seminary has unusual opportunity for the use of other methods as well.[18] Both methods were being used successfully by a few able teachers. However, according to the report, much of the teaching was dull and uninspiring, "frequently puerile and intellectually benumbing."[19]

Cases where the lecture method was used with stimulating effect with outside work being done by students were outnumbered by the cases in which the method was abused by both teacher and student. Kelly affirmed that the libraries were often locked and unheated and showed little indication of workshop conditions. The lectures were often sermonic, and the prevailing atmosphere of the classroom was that of the church. The interest of the lecturer lay in his highly specialized subject rather than the student. Sometimes the lecture was rapidly and monotonously read with

---

[16]Hugh Hartshorne and Milton C. Froyd, *Theological Education in the Northern Baptist Convention* (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1945), p. 186.

[17]Kelly, p. 55.

[18]Kelly, p. 224.

[19]Kelly, p. 55.

very little opportunity for observations by the lecturer or replies by the students. Even when attempts were made to elicit student participation, the response was timid and limited.[20]

A similar indictment was given the textbook method. Though occasionally used with skill, abuses were as common as those of the lecture method. Sometimes, reminiscent of high school practice, pages or chapters of elementary textbooks were assigned to the students. The recitations occasionally displayed a lack of mastery of the assignment by both professor and student. In one case the professor read from the textbook during the entire class hour.[21]

The Kelly study noted that the theme, motive, and assurance of satisfaction of work well done in the seminary are unparalleled. Therefore, an unusual opportunity exists for the use of other teaching methods that would result in a high level of pedagogical achievement. Surprise was expressed that more functional methods of teaching had not been introduced in the seminary, since they had been demonstrated successfully in other types of professional and vocational schools. Reference was made to a small group of theological institutions using the seminar, the library, the laboratory, and the field trip in successfully developing student initiative and resourcefulness.[22]

According to the May Report

The May report listed four teaching methods: (1) the recitation, (2) the lecture, (3) the discussion, and (4) the case, project, or similar method.[23] Morris considered the lack of coordination among the curriculum, the classroom, and the library to be the chief defect of the schools in relation to the library, and his reference to the lecture and textbook indicated that there had been little change since Kelly's report.[24]

---

[20]Kelly, pp. 55-56.

[21]Kelly, p. 56.

[22]Kelly, pp. 57, 254.

[23]Brown, p. 134.

[24]Morris, p. 189.

According to Hartshorne

The criticism of Hartshorne related more to theological teachers than methods. His strongest indictment was the statement that "there are few theological professors today who would be certified to teach in the schools of any state." He was impressed by the learning and academic training of the faculty, as well as the fact that they were widely travelled. However, the one outstanding need specified was "faculty members who are trained in education." The report stated that specialists in theology could no more be expected to naturally have great wisdom concerning educational processes than specialists in education could be expected to exhibit great wisdom on theological issues. A cross-fertilization was needed to improve the situation. In addition, graduate work tended to be so highly specialized in relation to a particular study that it lost all functional meaning. Although those who were engaged in graduate work often aimed to be teachers or to serve in some type of leadership, only rarely was the professional job of teaching or other forms of leadership included in their studies.[25]

LIBRARIES

The libraries of the period were the product of their educational environment, according to the data available. Their state was deplorable, and they were at the mercy of the academic community. There were, however, glimpses of improvement here and there.

According to Kelly

Kelly's lack of attention to the library reveals his own lack of regard for it as well as the minor place it held in theological education. In a book containing 400 pages of text and an additional fifty-six pages of appendices and index, less than one page was devoted to libraries.

Although the report stated that there were some excellent reading rooms and some that were more than adequate, it gives a poor impression of the libraries of the period. In some libraries, books were not accessible or convenient, and lighting facilities were inadequate. Modern

---

[25]Hartshorne, p. 219.

educational methods were not demonstrated in the administration of the libraries. Adequate research libraries or laboratories of the kind needed for research were possessed by very few seminaries. The value of books in the libraries often was less than 9 percent of the plant assets of the institutions. Expenditures for libraries were generally low.[26]

Library Conditions in 1926

The poor conditions shared by college and university libraries were described by Charles B. Shaw, Librarian at Women's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, in an article printed in 1926:

> Among the leading universities and colleges of the country there are no officially established and enforced regulations concerning matters vital to the well being of their libraries. Other factors in academic life have this protective legislation. But the librarian and his staff may be professionally inadequate; the staff may be insufficient in number; all may be overworked and underpaid. The book collection may be pitifully small, unsuited to the legitimate demands made upon it, and growing at only a snail's pace.[27]

According to the May Report

The scholars who made this survey evidently regarded the library as of secondary importance, for they paid little attention to it. The report contained over fourteen thousand pages, with sixty-two chapters in three volumes and one volume containing tables of statistics, questionnaires, etc. The material on libraries consisted of one chapter of forty-three pages, a section entitled "Library Services" containing three paragraphs, of which one was less than three lines long, and a section entitled "The Seminary Library" containing only five paragraphs. However, it is still as comprehensive as any library study made up to this time, being a condensation of Morris' master's thesis. The pitiful state of theological libraries at the time of this report is realized when we note that they were even worse than the university and college libraries whose inadequacies were deplored by Shaw in 1926.

---

[26] Kelly, pp. 42, 44, 201, 206.

[27] L. R. Elliott, "Seminary Libraries and Theological Education." *Bulletin 18,* AATS, 1948, p. 82, citing Charles B. Shaw, *Library Journal,* 51:77-79, January, 1926.

Overall view. The picture given of the libraries was a disappointing one. In general, they were inferior, poorly housed, poorly equipped, understaffed, and their administration inadequate. Compared with college and university libraries, their equipment was decidedly inferior even though they were comparable age-wise.[28] Morris said:

> Until the library is looked upon as an active teaching unit, as a laboratory wherein students are taught to be constructive in their thinking, to create rather than to receive something handed down from the previous generation, it will remain as it is, a decidedly secondary unit in the institution it serves.[29]

Purpose. The report indicated that the purpose of the theological library "is to collect material of a theological or religious nature to meet the instructional demands of the institutions of which they are a part."[30]

Use. The majority of seminary graduates had no opportunity to become acquainted with a good library and they possessed a limited knowledge of theological literature. Twenty-eight institutions reported the chief use of their libraries was for classroom preparation, eleven indicated that little research was done in the library, and only five indicated that library research was required. The thesis bibliographies examined by Morris showed little evidence of use of primary or extensive source material.[31]

Personnel. Most of the libraries were inadequately staffed. The librarian was considered a secretary or clerical helper who recorded and catalogued books, dusted them, and brought them to the patron. In many cases he was an instructor to whom certain extra duties of library administration had been assigned.[32]

Morris indicated that there was a danger that the money spent on books and buildings might be wasted unless an efficient staff was secured. Only about 45 percent of the institutions studied had a full-time

---

[28]Brown, p. 136.

[29]Morris, p. 189.

[30]Morris, p. 153.

[31]Brown, p. 137; Morris, p. 166.

[32]Brown, pp. 136-137; Morris, p. 184.

librarian. About four out of five librarians had college training, less than two in five had theological training, and only twenty out of forty-five had either professional library training or previous library experience. Twenty-five of the forty-five full-time librarians were women.[33]

The authority for book selection was given to the library committee in twenty-one institutions, to faculty members in sixteen, the librarian in fifteen, and the president, warden, or dean in thirteen. Of the forty-five full-time librarians, twenty-three reported salaries ranging from fifty dollars a year to five thousand dollars with an average salary of $1,730. The average salary paid librarians was less than that of any faculty rank except instructors. The average for full-time library assistants was the lowest of any group.[34]

Because of the clerical concept of librarianship, the cataloguers in these schools lacked the educational qualifications to do an adequate job. The term "librarian" in many cases was misleading, because the individual holding the title usually was a professor who delegated the essential tasks of the library to assistants. In some cases the librarian was also the registrar, warden, or president. The librarian usually was the supervisor of the library, with the power to hire and fire his assistants, sometimes serving as a member, secretary, or chairman of the library committee, but without responsibility for drafting the library budget, and in most cases having no control over the expenditure of money.[35] Morris suggested that the librarian should possess not only a combination of book knowledge and library techniques, but sufficient knowledge of educational theory and methods to insure that the library was integrated in the school's educational scheme and not merely an appendage.[36]

Financial support. The average budget of one hundred seminary libraries studied was $4,781.44, including salaries and wages. The average expenditure per student for libraries exceeded the minimum standard recommended by the American Library Association but was inadequate for theological libraries because of the relatively small enrollment of theo-

---

[33]Morris, p. 184.

[34]Morris, pp. 154, 184-186.

[35]Morris, pp. 163, 184.

[36]Morris, p. 183.

logical institutions compared to colleges. Morris suggested that the minimum expenditure for libraries should be 9 percent of the total institutional budget, instead of the average at that time of 4.6 percent.[37]

Buildings. Morris applied to theological schools a quotation from a contemporary scholar that the greatest failure of colleges and universities was their library buildings. Twenty-three of thirty-six institutions visited housed their libraries in buildings that were merely units within a group of attached buildings or were used for other purposes. The library reading room facilities were usually adequate but poorly lighted, and often insufficient stack space was provided for books. The usefulness of some library buildings was limited because they were originally designed for other purposes. The severest limitations were in cataloging rooms, work rooms, and the librarian's office. These defects were not due to a lack of funds or buildings, or to peculiar demands placed upon the type of library, but to the fact that the need and importance of these areas had not been stressed to the architect. Many institutions showed more pride in their chapels than in their libraries and library equipment.[38]

Statement by Middle States Association

A statement by the Middle States Association in 1937 urged that the library be considered the heart of a higher educational institution. The degree to which the library collection supported and supplemented the instruction and the extent to which faculty and students used the books was to be a primary consideration, and "the commission will insist above all else that a college library shall not be a repository."[39]

The First Standards for Accrediting

The 1936 report of the Commission on Accrediting Institutions of Theological Education included the following statement that constituted the first standard for theological libraries:

---

[37]Brown, p. 137; Morris, pp. 179, 182. [38]Morris, pp. 150-51, 189.

[39]Elliott, "Seminary Libraries," p. 83, citing a quote by Carl M. White, *The Educational Record*, 20:62, January, 1939.

> An accredited Theological Seminary or College should have a library which is live, adequate, well distributed, and professionally administered, with collections bearing especially upon subjects taught and with definite appropriations for the purchase of new books and the appropriate contemporary periodicals.[40]

Branscomb's Report

Harvie Branscomb, a leading theological educator, provided a powerful voice for the proper recognition of the role of the theological library. In 1937-38 he directed a survey of the Association of American Colleges that resulted in the publication of the book *Teaching with Books*. This cooperative effort, which was nationwide in scope, and the report that resulted had a far-reaching impact on education in general as well as theological education, and still influences education today.

Statement in Southern Association Quarterly

A report in 1942 indicated that for the preceding two decades the major interest in college libraries had been in growth, suitable buildings, and technically trained librarians. The report stated: "at present, the prime concern of college teachers, librarians, and administrators is in the effective integration of the library with the teaching processes." It also stated that if such an integration was to be achieved, there must be a clarification of the function of the college library, and continuous planning and cooperation by the administration, faculty, and a well-qualified library staff.[41]

According to Hartshorne

The Hartshorne report is characterized by the absence of comment on the theological library.

---

[40]AATS, *Bulletin 11*, 1943, p. 43.

[41]Elliott, "Seminary Libraries," p. 83, citing *The Southern Association Quarterly*, 6:468-71, November 1942.

SUMMARY

The establishment of AATS evidenced the concern felt by theological educators for the effectiveness of theological education. The AATS gave corporate expression to a large segment of Amerian theological education, creating an entity that could examine and evaluate itself. It also provided a forum for the more progressive educators to enunciate their views at its biennial sessions. Little time elapsed before authorized and authoritative studies were being made, published, and discussed at AATS conferences. The positive influence of AATS on the improvement of American theological education is of singular importance.

Any syntonic relationship among the dynamics we are studying was indirect, nonexistent, or negative. The negative influence is seen in the lack of demand for learning resources by the educational process; thus the expenditure of funds for the library seemed an extravagance. The impoverishment of the library forced the educational process to depend on the teacher and the textbook. Apparently, there was no correlation or coordination of these three dynamics, which inhibited positive improvement of any of the three; thus there was little or no positive change within theological institutions.

Some farsighted theological educators, however, such as Harvie Branscomb, exerted their efforts where they apparently could do the most good, through AATS. The May report, despite the inadequate attention to libraries, nonetheless contained a powerful statement of the case for the library. Branscomb, an administrator, and Morris, a librarian, were the two most articulate and effective champions of the true role of the library in their day, and perhaps in the history of theological education. Morris very capably articulated the incontrovertible statistics of the library's plight, and graphically portrayed the proper role of the library. Branscomb's work spotlighted the library's educational role. The May report's influence on colleges and universities indirectly affected theological libraries. Since these works were based on surveys they could not be discounted as mere rhetoric. They provided authoritative sources, and those who championed the educational value of the library could cite them to support their conclusions.

Another influence on library improvement was the appointment and report of the Committee on the Curriculum. The report revealed there were other theological educators who recognized the poverty of an educational system that majored on content-transmission and was knowledge-centered. It also provided a vehicle of enlightenment concerning the fallacies and dangers in the job-centered and information-centered approaches. AATS members and readers of the report were made aware that there were options to the traditional approach. The call for an educational approach that equipped students to solve problems rather than dispense ready-made answers became a theme song, with variations, of succeeding theological educators. S. J. Case, chairman of the committee, illustrated experiments at the University of Chicago Divinity School providing the faint-hearted with a pioneer to follow. The phrase used by Case, "lock-step of the old educational chain gang," became a catch phrase to denote an educational system of uniformity and conformity.

An explanation of the sterility and ineffectiveness of theological teaching methods was provided by Hartshorne's depiction of the combination of erudition in subject matter and ignorance of educational teaching theory on the part of theological faculty members. He stated the need for reform and called for a thorough overhauling of the theological educational enterprise. His call for inclusion of training in education for faculty members was answered in 1971 in proposed AATS standards calling for such training for candidates for teaching-research doctoral degrees.

College and university libraries were helpless pawns in the academic community, and the condition of the theological library was even worse. The library accurately mirrored its environment. It was poor, but it was just what the academic community needed and deserved. However, there were rays of hope here and there, most of them due to the influence of accrediting associations.

The report of one association of schools of higher education called for a central role for the library in the academic community and indicated the intent of the body that the library was not to be a repository. Another articulated the concern prevalent in the college world for the health and well-being of the library and the hope for integration with the educational process. The first standard for theological

libraries, approved by AATS in 1936, though less explicit than needed, was nevertheless a strong first step in the right direction.

The influence of the three dynamics on each other was not exerted in the context one might rightfully expect--the individual institution. Rather, the influence upon the library was indirect. Creative support for the library did not come from within the academic community. Instead, influence was exerted mostly by a relatively small group of educators working outside their own institutions or out of the context of a few schools that were more progressive than most. AATS provided an adequate vehicle for the exertion of these influences. As AATS grew in power and scope its influence became more effective, and this influence affected the library more than the other two dynamics.

CHAPTER IV

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE LIBRARY'S ROLE, 1947-1960

The era following the founding of AATS and prior to the period under discussion was marked by a study of theological education in each decade. Theological libraries had exerted little influence on their educational environment, and the scholars making the surveys, while discovering the flaws in theological education's philosophy and method, failed to see the role of the library in providing a remedy for the flaws.

The desires of AATS and the plans of a few visionary librarians coalesced in the establishment of ATLA. This organization provided a forum for a number of librarians and a few administrators to articulate very clearly the role of the library. A major study, *The Advancement of Theological Education*, was published, which delineated the ills of the educational process and pictured an acceptable role for the library. However, the report failed to propose the utilization of the library in the cure of these ills. The efforts of theological librarians and administrators with insight influenced the theological library to continue to outgrow the need expressed by its environment.

GROUNDWORK FOR THE DEVELOPMENTS OF THIS PERIOD

Three actions of AATS in its 1946 meeting influenced the further development of theological libraries. (1) A proposal for a Committee on Library Book Lists to prepare and publish a bibliography of theological literature, with Harvie Branscomb to serve as chairman, was accepted. (2) A resolution requesting the Executive Committee to consider calling a conference of theological librarians was approved. (3) The Association also voted to make a study of library work during the biennium 1948-1950.[1]

---

[1] Mehl, pp. 235-236.

The American Theological Library Association

The decision by AATS to study library work stimulated the founding of ATLA. This organization, along with the growing interest in libraries by administrators, brought about a revision of library standards and the articulation of the importance of the library in theological education. The founding of ATLA in 1947 was the culmination of a number of influences.

Preparatory influences.[2] The need for an association of theological librarians was felt for a number of years before the association was organized. A round table of theological librarians was established at the American Library Association meeting in 1916. The name was enlarged the next year to Round Table of the Libraries of Religion and Theology. This group failed to meet the needs of theological librarians because its interests soon shifted to the needs of the religion sections of public libraries. The establishment of AATS in 1918 provided a sponsor for this association. The publication of Branscomb's *Teaching With Books* highlighted the educational function of the library and sharpened interest in the role of the library in theological education.

Theological librarians had been meeting informally in connection with the American Library Association conferences since 1941. Some of them had planned a nationwide conference of theological librarians, but when they learned that AATS had authorized such a conference, they merged plans. The first national conference was held at Louisville, Kentucky, in 1947.

The resolution approved by AATS that resulted in the formation of ATLA affirmed a growing recognition among theological educators that a closer integration of the library in the educational program of colleges and universities had equal significance for theological education. Since the association had already voted to study library work during 1948-1950, a conference on theological library work seemed desirable.[3]

---

[2]Elliott, "Hitherto...," pp. 1-3.

[3]American Association of Theological Schools, *Bulletin 17*, 1946, p. 57.

First conference. The first conference was attended by fifty librarians, one president, and one dean. Most of the program was devoted to general surveys of seminary library work. A permanent organization was effected by adopting a name, a tentative constitution, and a slate of officers with an executive committee.[4] Since that time ATLA has met annually and has worked very closely with AATS.

Influence of ATLA. It would be difficult to overstate the contribution of ATLA. However, since it has worked so closely with AATS, it is equally difficult to assess its unique contribution. It has aroused concern for stronger library resources and a more adequate staff, and stressed the importance of subject knowledge for librarians. It has encouraged the recognition of the library's importance. The organization and administration of the Library Development Program was one of its most important accomplishments.[5] ATLA and the increased interest in theological libraries provided theological librarians an opportunity to present a case for their libraries.

The Niebuhr Report (1957)

In June, 1946, AATS decided to dedicate 1948-50 to a study of the libraries of the schools of the Association. In its 1948 meeting, AATS voted

> . . . to appoint a committee of three to make a preliminary study and report to the Executive Committee a plan for a thorough study of libraries which would lead to the establishment of standards for library budgets, controls and ideals by which the Commission on Accrediting could be guided and that the Executive Committee be authorized to appropriate up to $1,000 to carry out this plan.[6]

The committee decided unanimously in November, 1948, to recommend to the Executive Committee "that there be conducted a *survey of the*

---

[4]Elliott, "Hitherto," p. 4.

[5]Mehl, pp. 236, 239-240; Kenneth S. Gapp, "The American Theological Library Association," *Library Trends*, 9:199, October, 1960.

[6]Walter N. Robert, "Steps Toward a Library Survey," *Summary of Proceedings*, Third Annual Conference, ATLA, 1949, p. 1.

libraries in relation to the curriculum and teaching methods" of the accredited theological schools of AATS. This recommendation was approved by the Executive Committee in December of 1948. At the same meeting the Executive Committee decided another survey of theological education in America should be made. It was decided at a later date to include the library in the general survey.[7]

A committee was appointed to seek a chairman, but the man asked to serve was unable to do so. The committee then recommended that the Executive Committee, the Accrediting Commission of the association, and the president of AATS meet to consider the advisability of the survey. The group met in March, 1949, and constituted itself "a Survey Commission of the American Association of Theological Schools to give direction to a survey of theological education in America." A chairman and secretary were named for the Survey Commission and a committee was chosen to approach a foundation for financial support for the survey.[8] The report was published in book form in *The Advancement of Theological Education* in 1957, with H. Richard Niebuhr, professor of theology and ethics at Yale Divinity School, and director of the study, Daniel Day Williams, associate director, and James Gustafson, assistant director and secretary of the advisory committee, as co-authors. This is called the Niebuhr report because of Niebuhr's leading role in its preparation.

Robert G. Torbet, Dean and Professor of Church History at Central Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, described this report:

> The report on theological education disclosed that church leaders by and large were not aware of what could be learned from educators in other professions, like medicine and law. In some theological institutions, there was either a dead traditionalism or a directionless effort to respond to pressures of modernity so as to be without focus. It was disclosed that only one-half of the 150 theological schools in the United States were in the American Association of Theological schools. In addition, there were about 200 Bible schools which were not of graduate school level.

---

[7]Roberts, "Steps," pp. 2-3.

[8]Edward H. Roberts, "Report of the Committee on a Survey of Theological Education," *Summary of Proceedings*, Fourth Annual Conference, ATLA, 1950, p. 3.

> Financial pressures and the lack of competent and trained men for the seminaries added to the complex of problems to be faced.
>
> On the happier side of the ledger, the survey revealed that there was remarkable growth of graduate education in theology between 1920 and 1955. Faculties were better trained. Important changes had taken place in the theological curriculum: (1) Subject matter had been greatly enlarged by the subject-division of traditional studies and by the introduction of new courses. (2) The elective system had been generally adopted. (3) Provision had been made for differentiated ministry--institutional chaplains, directors of religious education, military chaplains and parish ministers. (4) The importance of "learning by doing" had led to the development of field education programs. Moreover, there had been a modest movement in the past twenty years toward more inter-denominational student bodies.[9]

However, as the survey indicated, the situation in theological education still left a great deal to be desired.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Two phenomena both reflected and affected the philosophy of theological education during this period: the critiques by educators and the Neibuhr report.

Critiques of Theological Education

A number of theological librarians and a few administrators took advantage of the forums provided by ATLA and AATS conferences to articulate the role of the theological library. Refusing to be parochial in their outlook, they addressed the larger, educational issues. The importance of the library grew out of its relationship to the total educational enterprise. The educational objectives of theological education were important because of their influence on the library's role.

Sherrill and Kuhlman. At the first conference of ATLA, Lewis J. Sherrill, Dean and Professor of Religious Education at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, charged theological education with inadequate thinking

---

[9]Torbet, p. 328.

methods, an educational process that was confined to textbook presentations, and a burden of too many required courses.[10] A. F. Kuhlman, director of the joint university libraries of Vanderbilt University and George Peabody and Scarrit colleges, indicated that the curriculum did not require extensive utilization of library materials.[11]

Elliott. L. R. Elliott, Librarian at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, was invited to address AATS in 1948. He indicated that the educational emphasis should change from teaching and the teacher to learning and the student, with more responsibility being placed on the student. According to Elliott, the test of the effectiveness of the educational process is how well the student learns.[12]

Trost. At the 1949 ATLA conference, Theodore Trost, Librarian at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, indicated that theological education must provide a student-centered or profession-centered rather than subject-centered curriculum, teaching techniques that would insure the maximum integration of knowledge by the student, and an opportunity for him to gain confidence and competence for the work of the ministry. Proposing what he called "the Learning Curriculum," Trost indicated the curriculum should be regarded as a continuing learning experience and that learning how to learn is perhaps the most important skill for the seminarian to acquire. The student should be equipped to solve the problems that will face him in his ministry. Concentration on academic scholarship, expecting the student to develop professional skills on the field, is passé. A seminary's reputation is based not on what it does for, but what it does to, students.[13]

---

[10]Lewis J. Sherrill, "Accreditation--What is Adequacy?" *Summary of Proceedings*, First Annual Conference, ATLA, 1947, p. 21.

[11]A. F. Kuhlman, "The Library and Instruction," *Summary of Proceedings*, First Annual Conference, ATLA, 1947, pp. 15, 20.

[12]Elliott, "Seminary Libraries," pp. 86-91.

[13]Theodore Trost, "The Seminary Curriculum, the Library and the Librarian," *Summary of Proceedings*, Third Annual Conference, ATLA, 1949, pp. 29, 30-34, 36.

Morris. In an address to ATLA in 1951, Raymond P. Morris, librarian at Yale and one of the most vigorous and articulate spokesmen for theological libraries, maintained that "the primary thing we are after is effective educational process."[14] In another address to ATLA in 1956, Morris described theological education as defective. He criticized

> ... any mode of instruction which fails to throw the student on his own or which fails to recognize that much of education should be teaching a person how to work independently. Altogether too frequently our education results in immaturity, in an inability to walk alone, or to continue growth apart from reading lists or syllabi, or similar "props" and prompting. It is a mistaken notion that one cannot learn something new without first taking a course to introduce him to it. The failure to produce a mature product is one of the greatest shortcomings in American education.[15]

Tead. Ordway Tead, noted educator, author, and vice-president and director of Harper Publishers, stated in 1958 that "it is the passive role which the student has usually been asked to play that prompts the most insistent criticism of learning theory." He stated that the ideas and concepts students are asked to learn are often inert things that are irrelevant to student experience and concern.[16] Although Tead's remarks referred to higher education, they were applicable to theological education as well.

Bruner. Jerome S. Bruner, Director of the Center for Cognitive Studies at Harvard, is another who did not deal with theological education directly, but whose remarks are relevant to it. Speaking in 1959, Bruner deplored the passivity of the educational process, charging that its

---

[14]Raymond P. Morris, "Standards for Accreditation for the Theological Library," *Summary of Proceedings,* Fifth Annual Conference, ATLA, 1951, pp. 5, 8.

[15]Raymond P. Morris, "The Role of the Library in the Theological Seminary," *Bulletin 22,* AATS, 1956, p. 125.

[16]Ordway Tead, *Climate of Learning: a Constructive Attack on Complacency in Higher Education* (New York: Harper, 1958), p. 23.

emphasis was "upon gaining and storing information . . . in the form in which it is presented." He urged "that students be judged not on what they have learned--but on what they can generate from what they know, or how well they leap the barrier from learning to thinking."[17]

According to the Niebuhr Report

According to the Niebuhr report, a change was needed in the fundamental philosophy of theological education. Niebuhr charged that "the greatest defect in theological education today is that it is too much an affair of piecemeal transmission of knowledge and skills." Therefore, it offered too little challenge to the student "to develop his own resources and to become an independent, life-long inquirer, growing constantly while he is engaged in the work of the ministry." Law and medical schools and many colleges shared this defect, but were doing something to remedy defective practices more frequently than the seminaries. The report attacked the habit of "thinking of education as transmission of knowledge rather than companionship in learning."[18]

Continuing the "companionship in learning" theory, the report discounted as clichés the theories that urged the substitution of a student-centered approach for the subject-centered approach and belittled the lecture method of classroom instruction. The student who failed to concentrate on the subject was not a student but a "narcissistic self-pollenator," and the teacher who overconcentrated on the student became a nurse rather than a teacher. The question was "whether teacher and student were companions in inquiry into a challenging subject or whether the teacher conceived of himself as a retail distributor of intellectual and spiritual commodities." The lecture method, discussion method, or group dynamics are not in themselves tied to any particular approach to instruction. Not only must bad habits of thought and false philosophies

---

[17]Jerome S. Bruner, "Learning and Thinking," *Harvard Educational Review*, 29:186, Summer, 1959.

[18]H. Richard Niebuhr, Daniel Day Williams, and James M. Gustafson, *The Advancement of Theological Education* (New York: Harper, 1957), pp. 209-210.

be abandoned, but fit modes of expression must be given to truer philosophies of education. This "implies revision of instructional systems, reduction of class hours, increase of personal instruction and guidance, provision for seminars, honor courses, etc."[19]

Several practices were criticized. Attendance at too many classes and too many subjects were required of students. Each teacher provided instruction in too many subjects. Reading assignments were confined to textbooks or a limited reserve shelf. Too few sermons and papers were written and these too cursorily criticized. Attendance was required at too many survey courses and depth study was given in too few subjects. Seminars were too few and tutorial assistance was insufficient. However, the report stated:

> Yet if each of these criticisms were met, one by one, without a change in fundamental philosophy of education it is questionable whether anything would be accomplished. Improved methods of imparting knowledge remain methods of imparting knowledge rather than teaching methods. The student who profits by such improvement also suffers loss if he is led to believe that he has "completed his education."[20]

The report further stated that:

> . . . nothing can take the place of individual experiments by the more adventurous and least complacent institutions. The advancement of education in all other areas has been dependent on such pioneering movements by individual schools.[21]

TEACHING METHOD OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

The critiques of educators and the Niebuhr report again were the instruments that reflected and affected the teaching method of theological education.

Critiques of Teaching Method

Several theological librarians and administrators recognized the formative influence of faculty teaching methods upon the role of the

---

[19]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, p. 209. [20]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 209-210.

[21]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, p. 210.

library. They were willing to forcefully articulate the dynamics of current methods and their influence on the effectiveness of the theological school.

Elliott. In 1948, long before it became a popular viewpoint, L. R. Elliott stressed that the educational emphasis must be shifted from a teacher-teaching orientation to a learner-learning orientation, with responsibility placed on the student. He saw teaching ability more as the transfer of enthusiasm than dispensing of knowledge. The student should be a seeker for, rather than a recipient of, knowledge.[22]

Trost. Trost called for a "pedagogical conversion" of theological faculties. He indicated that the teaching faculty had little knowledge of educational principles and utilized a minimum of teaching technique. He said, "the teaching method, the student's notebook, the list of reserves, book reports, and, in some places, the recitation, are sacrosanct." The "pedagogical conversion" of the faculty was "the primary task that needs to be done in many seminaries. Seminaries need to be regarded as places where students learn rather than where students are taught."[23]

Morris. Morris criticized the methodology of theological education. He saw the use of the textbook, the lecture method, the limited reserve shelf, the failure to provide sufficient reading time, and the lack of projects involving student ingenuity, creativity, imagination, and independence as representing failure on the part of theological teachers.[24]

Tead. Ordway Tead criticized the traditional approach. He deplored the educational procedure that forced upon the student a routine of listening to lectures on schedule, doing required reading, and memorizing what he guessed would be asked on the final exam.[25]

---

[22]Elliott, *Seminary*, pp. 86-91. [23]Trost, pp. 31, 33-34, 36-37.

[24]Morris, *Role*, p. 125. [25]Tead, p. 23.

According to the Niebuhr Report

The key problem in American Protestant theological education, according to the Niebuhr report, was "providing and maintaining the most able core of teaching theologians and theological teachers possible." It added that "any wholesale condemnation of theological teaching as being slavishly traditional and unimaginative cannot be supported by the facts."[26] However, the report was critical of prevalent teaching methods.

"The didactic stance." The Niebuhr study refused to advocate the theory of student-centered teaching, calling for creativity and innovation. Condemnation of the lecture method was referred to as a cliché. However, the study criticized what is called "the didactic stance."

According to the report, the staff conducting the study, as well as many pastors and theological teachers they consulted, agreed that seminary education was affected by this "disease." This critique was not so much concerned with teaching methods as the relationship between teacher, student, and subject matter. "If this consists in the existence of an inert mass of fact and idea which is handed in small pieces by the teacher to the student then the heart of intellectual inquiry is betrayed."[27]

Symptoms of the didactic disease included lecturing to the exclusion of discussion, the pressure many teachers felt to "get everything in" their course, and the mechanical system of assignments. In reference to the "get everything in" philosophy, the report stated it would seem "a good principle that anything which students can learn by reading or in other ways should not take time in the classroom."[28] The report continued:

> We must underline the fact that in theological education even more than in some other fields the need is for personal maturation, an exploration of complex ideas, and a personal encounter with ultimate problems which cannot be reduced to the memorization of details or to a series of neatly planned lessons.[29]

---

[26]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 134, 203.

[27]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 134-135.

[28]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 134-135.

[29]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, p. 135.

"Getting everything in." The second pressure that led to dull routine methods was the need felt by many teachers to cover in their courses all the ground expected by the board of trustees or other ecclesiastical body. This feeling was based on the premise that a seminary graduate should be prepared for every eventuality. The acceptance of this impossible goal of preparing students for everything exerted constant pressure upon teachers and curriculum builders. In the frantic effort to "get everything in," the "everything" was treated superficially. More emphasis should be placed on theological honesty and maturity than rote learning, and then "the schools will be more free to develop significant courses, and to teach with greater effectiveness."[30]

The theological student. A third pressure came from the students. Students tended to be ambivalent in their feelings about theological education. Some resisted authority and at the same time craved an authoritarian answer to their questions. Artificial support supplied by the teacher could not touch the core of the problem because "students often become excessively dependent upon their professors and upon specific assignments." A course could be worked out giving the student security by designating exactly what he was to do, "but this may postpone his facing the questions upon which his personal growth depends."[31]

Sometimes the thological teacher was insecure and felt inadequate; he "covers his own sense of inadequacy by making excessive and legalistic demands. The teacher may avoid facing the questions which trouble him by confining his course to a well marked route." Sometimes the professor felt that his subject was neglected in the curriculum and compensated by making "ruthless demands upon students as a way of asserting the importance of his course."[32]

Results of content transmission. The content transmission method tended to make graduation the end of a process rather than the commencement

---

[30]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, p. 137.

[31]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 137-138.

[32]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 137-138.

of life-long learning. The graduate's life of study lay in the past, in the seminary classroom, and did not continue into the present or the future. The theology of seminary graduates was that of a professor whose lectures they had carefully copied and organized. They knew very little of independent reading or of making dialogue with a particular author.[33]

Elements of good theological teaching. Great teaching required specific attention to four points: (1) The theological teacher continually forces students to examine the ultimate presuppositions with which they think and with which they judge themselves and their fellows. (2) A close relationship is kept between the formal structure of thought and concrete human problems. (3) The good teacher gives attention to the relation of his subject to the vocational commitment students have made or are considering for the Christian ministry. (4) The ultimate topic is the bearing of human experience on our knowledge of God and the bearing of the Christian gospel upon our human response to God who is the source of our being.[34]

LIBRARIES

Theological libraries were strengthened during this period. Their needs were articulated very well by a number of leading theological educators. The Committee on Library Standards, a joint AATS-ATLA group, did its work well and presented a very comprehensive and detailed report which was approved. A later attempt to refine and improve the standards resulted in a weakening of the statement, although the minimum amounts required for library expenditures had been increased. The Niebuhr report indicated the conditions of the libraries. The establishment of a scholarship fund for the improvement of the training of theological librarians promised to strengthen the personnel situation. It was a fitting preparation period for the Library Development Program.

Critiques of Libraries by Theological Educators

Seven educators expressed their concept of the role of the library.

---

[33]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, p. 138. [34]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp.142-144.

Sherrill. Sherrill charged that under the conditions that prevailed in theological education in 1947, the library was likely "to be a dead appendage to the institute."[35]

Kuhlman. Kuhlman indicated that the heart of the problem concerning the role of the library was the integration of "the resources and services of our theological libraries with the instructional, research and public service efforts of our theological faculties."[36] He emphasized the importance of projecting a curriculum centered in library materials by the administration and faculty ir the library was to play a significant educational role.

Elliott. Elliott contended that the librarian must be an educator and know the curriculum and aims of the school if the library is to be an effective instrument. The librarian holds a place of such importance that he should be responsible only to the head of the school. Libraries must become real teaching instruments.[37]

Trost. Trost affirmed that the seminary librarian must be a student of educational method as well as an administrator and skilled technician. The library must be a resource for learning and content.[38]

Morris. Morris affirmed that the library was one of the two basic ingredients of the educational process, and "the educational program and the library program must be conceived as but two phases of one process, neither understandable without the other.[39]

Roberts. Walter N. Roberts, President of United Theological Seminary, stated in 1953 that the library had represented the weakest area of theological training twenty years before, and that the theological seminaries in AATS "have made more improvement in the library area in the last twenty years than in any other phase of their work."

---

[35]Sherrill, p. 21.

[36]Kuhlman, pp. 15, 20.

[37]Elliott, *Seminary*, pp.86-91.

[38]Trost, pp. 31, 33-34, 36-37.

[39]Morris, *Standards*, pp. 5, 8.

Speaking on what the seminary administration expects of the library, Roberts listed the following: an effective functioning unit of the educational program of the seminary; a department of the curriculum, serving the whole school; the study center of the school; a growing resource of information; a stimulus of industrious and devout scholarship; and a teaching unit of the school. Since "the president, the dean and the librarian occupy the key positions regarding the school curriculum," these expectations cannot be fulfilled by the librarian or his staff. The cooperation and teamwork of the trustees, president, dean, faculty, library staff, and the entire student body are an absolute necessity to an effective library.[40]

Niebuhr. In 1956, H. Richard Niebuhr wrote the following:

> A heartening sign in the present situation is the increase of interest among these librarians in their work as teachers and the increase of concern among faculties for the development of school libraries as teaching centers. . . . Wherever the theological student is at work he is challenged at very least by those most catholic of teachers, the competent librarians--to enter into conversation with a continuous, if not identical, group of thinkers.[41]

Revised Library Standards

The library standards of AATS were revised in 1952 as a result of the work of an AATS-ATLA Committee on Library Standards, Walter N. Roberts, chairman. The twenty-six page report of the Committee was very comprehensive.

The ideal library. The ideal library envisioned in the report should be the study center of the school and should ultimately be judged by the effectiveness with which it does its job in its own situation. The library program should be integrated into the objectives of the

---

[40] Walter N. Roberts, "What the Seminary Administration Expects of its Library," *Summary of Proceedings*, Seventh Annual Conference, ATLA, 1953, pp. 41-46.

[41] H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry: Reflections on the Aims of Theological Education* (New York: Harper, 1956), p. 13.

school, and the library regarded by students and faculty as an inseparable partner with the classroom in the learning process.

The library committee. The library committee should be essentially advisory.

Library personnel, etc. The librarian should be full time and professionally trained, with an appropriate number of library assistants who are adequately trained. An adequate book collection should be provided, arranged in an orderly and logical classification, and actively promoted. New students should be introduced to the library by a careful program of orientation. A great deal of attention was given to library buildings and equipment. Minimum expenditures were suggested for accredited schools.[42]

According to the Niebuhr Report

The AATS approved a library survey before authorizing the Niebuhr study, and there was a question at first whether the library survey should be a separate one of major magnitude before it was decided to include it as a major part of the survey of theological education. It is therefore ironic that the Niebuhr report stated "we found it impractical in the survey to give sufficient time to a detailed study of the libraries and their problems."[43]

The report affirmed steady improvement generally in theological libraries over the previous ten years. However, nineteen of the schools reported in 1955 that their libraries were poorly housed, and ten indicated their need of new space or building. Space for periodicals was lacking in many libraries and no study carrels were available. More reading space was needed by several libraries, and many, though adequate for the book collection, made "inadequate provision for the librarian's office, and for cataloging and work rooms." Personal observation by the

---

[42]AATS. *Report of the Committee on Library Standards*, chairman Walter N. Roberts (Dayton, Ohio: AATS, 1952); *Bulletin 20*, AATS, 1952, pp. 61-66.

[43]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, p. 130.

surveyors often led to the conclusion that the librarian's opinion that his office space was adequate was because he "had developed a stoic attitude through many years in cramped quarters."[44]

It is difficult to apply a general rule concerning a minimum budget for a theological library because of the many variable factors to be taken into account. However, the report stated that

> . . . a large number of libraries are barely managing to keep a minimal standard for staff and book collection, and that the maintenance of genuinely adequate libraries is becoming an increasingly acute problem for nearly all the schools.[45]

After noting some of the factors affecting the adequacy of the book collection in a theological library the report stated "there is still much to be done before it can be said that the schools have adequate working collections for faculty and students."[46]

Expenditures. The study indicated that the percentages of total expenditures devoted to the library had been raised from 3.4 percent in 1928-29, as reported in the study by May, to 6 percent in 1953-54, as revealed in a study of a similar number of schools by the Niebuhr group. The report also indicated that the average expenditures per student for the library in twenty-six typical schools rose from thirty-eight dollars in 1934-35 to seventy-six dollars in 1954-55, an increase of 100 percent.[47]

Librarians. In some schools the librarian was a full member of the faculty even though he had no teaching responsibilities, but in many schools he was not. The report suggests:

> It appears from our study that schools ought seriously to consider making the librarian's position one of faculty status, seeking persons who understand the teaching responsibilities of the office, paying them accordingly, and enlisting them fully in the discussion and work of the teaching program. Where this

---

[44]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, p. 130.

[45]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 130-131.

[46]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 130-131.

[47]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 28, 36.

> is not done an important resource for criticism, guidance, and help to the faculty's teaching program is being overlooked.[48]

Although the report did not make a categorical statement concerning faculty status for the librarian, it did emphasize two critical points:

> First, good communication between the librarian and those who teach and counsel the students may well be enhanced by faculty status; second, such character, ability, and training in the librarian that he or she merits the responsibility of full relation to the teaching function.[49]

The scarcity of trained and competent librarians was attributed to inadequate salaries and the lack of persons with a proper background for librarianship. The report stated that "the salaries of librarians tend to be too far below the faculty level, even in those cases where the librarian has good preparation." Even when the head librarian was well trained, he was "likely to be overburdened with cataloging and other duties, and his assistants are often completely untrained people." Because of these and other factors the librarians were "unable to give full attention to the development of the book collection and other activities designed to increase the use of the library."[50] Even though more adequate salaries would improve the situation, other means were needed to recruit more theologically educated people for theological librarianship.

> Lying back of the problem of enlisting competent people there is the question of how the schools conceive the librarian's task. If this is regarded mainly as the shelving of books, then few able people will be enlisted. A creative conception of the librarian's role as teacher and advisor is called for throughout the schools.[51]

Recognition was not always given to the strategic teaching position of the librarian. "Often the librarian knows more about the operation of the school as a teaching institution and the study habits of

---

[48]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, p. 66.

[49]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 133, 203.

[50]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 131-132.

[51]Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 131-132.

students than do other members of the faculty and administrative officers."[52] Because of his knowledge of student study habits and his counseling role to students, the librarian was qualified to advise faculty members about class assignments and observe their results. He could consult with students about their emotional attitudes toward reading and help them learn how to read, work out a bibliography, or "to discriminate between what is important and what is not in pursuing a subject. Too few discussions are held between librarians and faculties on these points."[53]

Buildings and equipment. Since schools claimed their library was the center of their academic life as the chapel was the center of their worship life, they needed to take the attractiveness of their libraries more seriously. Such elementary details as good housekeeping, cleanliness, and adequate heat and lighting were imperative, but many of the libraries looked like morgues. The report stated that the equipment of the seminaries was good, but several schools were showing their lack of concern "for more advanced teaching methods by their failures to provide seminar rooms, faculty studies, library cubicles, etc."[54] Mention has already been made of the stoic manner in which many librarians adjusted to cramped office space.

Lilly Scholarship Fund Established (1958)

An attempt to improve the educational qualifications and status of the librarians of the member schools of AATS and ATLA was initiated in 1958 when a grant of $9,000 was made by Lilly Endowments, Inc.

> Modeled somewhat after the faculty fellowships offered by AATS, the program is designed, by the awarding of scholarships for further study of library procedures or other relevant subjects, to increase the competence of library personnel, improve the services of the libraries, lead to a greater recognition of qualified library personnel and, in general, raise the level of

---

[52] Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 129-130.

[53] Niebuhr, *Advancement*, pp. 129-130.

[54] Niebuhr, *Advancement*, p. 133.

> selection and training of personnel for seminary libraries. In 1959, the Lilly Endowment, Inc. agreed to support the project further by making an additional grant of $27,000 to be paid in annual installments of $9,000 for three more years.[55]

This program continued to make a beneficial contribution to theological librarianship throughout the sixties.

New Library Standards (1958)

That AATS closely monitored adherence to its standards is indicated by a bulletin of information in January, 1956. The Commission on Accrediting, noting that several accredited schools of the Association fell below the standard for library expenditures, had voted that, though no notations on libraries were to be given at the time, the Executive Secretary was to send a letter to these schools,

> . . . calling attention to the standards and what the respective school has spent and indicating that if the situation is not remedied a notation or notations will be given (or continued) two years hence when the review takes place.[56]

In December of 1956 a joint AATS-ATLA committee was authorized by the Executive Committee of AATS to make a study of library standards.[57] The revision of the standards proposed by the committee was adopted at the annual meeting of AATS in 1958.

Although the minimum amounts for library expenditures were increased over the 1952 requirements, the standards were shortened considerably and a number of items left out. The intent in revising the standards evidently was to conserve space and insure a more concise and direct statement. In the process, the overall effectiveness of the standards was weakened because a number of statements of a philosophical nature were deleted. The 1958 standards contained five paragraphs, compared to thirty-two in those adopted in 1952.[58]

---

[55]Gapp, p. 199.

[56]AATS, *Bulletin of Information*, January 14, 1956, p. 3.

[57]AATS, *Bulletin 23*, 1958, p. 80.

[58]AATS, *Bulletin 20*, 1952, pp. 61-66; AATS, *Bulletin 23*, 1958, pp. 8-9.

Beach's Evaluation (1960)

Beach pointed out in 1960 that between the Morris report in 1930 and the report of the Committee on Library Standards in 1952 the average seminary library collection had grown from 31,956 to approximately 50,000 volumes. The average current periodical subscription list had grown from 96 to 182. There were also a large number of new or remodeled library buildings and several major plants in the planning or construction stages.[59]

Beach stressed that still larger libraries were needed because of increased student enrollments, increasing stress upon graduate level study, changing curricular emphases, and new and specialized programs. In addition, the libraries needed further strengthening because of their original weakness.[60]

The salaries of librarians in 1960 were significantly higher than Morris reported in 1930. The largest concentration of librarians' salaries were equated with the salaries of instructors, whereas Morris had indicated in his study that the librarians' salaries, though low, were higher than those of instructors. The salary progress of librarians, therefore, was not significant in comparison with other groups. Beach indicated that qualified library school graduates were commanding professional salaries several hundred dollars higher than the median figure AATS reported in 1960 for catalogers.[61]

The average annual expenditures of accredited AATS member schools for books and periodicals had approximately doubled between 1952 and 1959, but the increase was not nearly as large as it seemed when inflation was taken into account. Beach indicated the standards developed by AATS and ATLA were having a beneficial effect on seminary library budgets. Though staffing was still a problem, ATLA was working steadily to improve both the standards for and the quality of theological librarianship.[62]

The cooperative strategies among seminary libraries was perhaps the brightest note on the theological library scene. Effective ATLA

---

[59]Beach, p. 141.

[60]Beach, p. 141.

[61]Beach, pp. 142-143.

[62]Beach, pp. 143-144.

programs included the *Index to Religious Periodical Literature*, the microfilming work of the Board of Micro-text, and a plan for periodical exchange between member libraries. Other cooperative programs indicated the growing strength of theological libraries.[63]

SUMMARY

Several forces during this period stimulated library improvement. This stimulation was not generated directly from either the educational philosophy or teaching methods of theological education. The "didactic stance" prevailed, and teachers continued to attempt to transmit knowledge and skills in piecemeal fashion. Any reciprocal influence of the three dynamics was insignificant or nonexistent.

ATLA was the product of the efforts of both librarians and administrators. A national organization of theological librarians was impending; fortunately it was an outgrowth of AATS. It is significant that AATS, one year prior to the establishment of ATLA, had authorized a study to be made during 1948-50 of theological libraries in relation to curriculum and teaching methods.

The most significant result of the establishment of ATLA was that it provided a logical forum and a vehicle for the articulation of the library's proper role: leading theological educators began to call for a more effective educational process that gave a more central role to the library. They called for an educational process in the late 1940's that was student- and learning-centered, the theme of many educators today. When a leading librarian addressed AATS on "Seminary Libraries and Theological Education," he expressed the larger educational issues.

The study headed by Niebuhr was of major significance and influence. The report tactfully did not indict theological teaching methods and philosophy in a wholesale manner. However, its analysis of these dynamics was incisive, to the point, and honest. A central role was assigned the librarian as an educator and counselor of students and teachers. The depiction of the library was accurate and sympathetic.

---

[63] Beach, pp. 144-146.

The lack of synthesis of the foregoing elements is indicated by the apologetic admission that there had been insufficient time to make a major study of libraries. This lack of syntony among philosophy, method, and the library has characterized theological education. It is difficult to ascertain whether the vision of theological educators in general has been myopic, or if they have refused to admit that a relationship exists between the sterility of the classroom and the poverty of the library.

Despite the discouraging status of libraries, visionary educators continued their efforts for improvement. In 1952, a comprehensive report on library standards was approved by AATS. Its aim was to integrate the library into the educational process. The solicitation of funds from Lilly Endowments, Inc. to enhance the qualifications of library personnel was another step toward improvement.

The theological library had progressed in every aspect. The average book and periodical collection had almost doubled since the time of Morris' report in 1930; there were a number of new or projected buildings; and the salary, expertise, and status of the librarian had improved. The neglect of the libraries, however, was reflected in the academic community. The libraries were still inadequate in financial support, personnel, building, and collections, but most of all in their utilization by the institutions they served.

The libraries were adequate for the expressed needs of their institutions, except perhaps in research resources for the faculty. The textbook and the didactic stance were a source of satisfaction to most theological faculties. Even the educators who lamented the failures of the theological system failed or refused to see and accept the central role the library could play in the solution of the problems. Library improvement mirrored the influence, not of its immediate environment, but of AATS.

CHAPTER V

A DECADE OF PHYSICAL GROWTH, 1961-1971

A Library Development Program, made possible by a special grant and administered by ATLA and AATS, supplied many of the factors necessary for the syntony of educational objectives and library resources to produce more effective theological education during the sixties. There was significant library growth and improvement as the theological community gave concerted attention to library needs, but theological education failed to escape the ruts that had held it in the same course for so many years. Theological educators continued to call for improvement, and AATS actions in 1971-72 indicated the probability of reform in theological education.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE DEVELOPMENTS OF THIS PERIOD

Guy R. Lyle, Director of Libraries at Emory University and an authority on library administration, indicated in 1961 that the surest way for libraries to progress was for them to strengthen and develop the interest of administrative personnel and faculty. Administrators needed to have defined for them "clearly and unequivocally . . . what constitutes the essential requirements for good library service." The faculty needed to be encouraged to place more reliance upon use of the library. The librarian needed to keep informed about curricular matters, and to have a clear concept of the reasons why library support is desirable and possible.[1] These factors in library improvement and promotion were to receive new impetus in over ninety theological schools in the first part of the sixties through the influence of the Library Development Program.

The Library Development Program (1961-1966)

At the 1961 meeting of ATLA, it was announced that a grant of

---

[1]Guy R. Lyle, *The Administration of the College Library* (New York: Wilson, 1961). pp. 10-11.

$875,000 had been made by Sealantic Fund, Inc. for a library program to benefit the accredited members of ATLA. This initial grant was augmented by $436,750 in September, 1964, making available $1,311,750 for the program, which continued for five years.[2]

A maximum amount of $3,000 per year per institution was made available for book purchases. Each institution was required to match the grant, dollar for dollar, over and above their average expenditures for books and periodicals for the two-year period 1958/1959 and 1960/1961.[3] The program was a challenge to each institution to significantly increase their book expenditures above their normal budgeted amounts.

The program was administered by a board appointed for this specific purpose, with additional administrative help from an advisory committee. An office was maintained in New Haven, Connecticut, to handle correspondence and routine detail. Meetings of the Executive Board and joint meetings of the Board and advisory committee were held periodically to define policy and plan the mode of operation. Regional meetings were held with representatives of the participating institutions to explain the program. Periodic bulletins directed the procedures and informed the participants of progress made. A book list and a self-study guide were provided for institutional assistance. The funds from Sealantic were distributed through the AATS office in Dayton.[4]

Each participating institution was encouraged to make a study of its library involving the entire academic community, including the librarian, library committee, faculty, and administrative officers. The study was to include examination of the relationship between library service and instruction, between instruction and research in professional theological education, and to weigh the objectives of the library in relation to the purposes of the institution. Close attention was to be given to factors that would strengthen and increase the quality and adequacy of library resources. These self-studies were intended to encourage the academic

---

[2]Raymond P. Morris, "ATLA Library Development Program," *Summary of Proceedings*, Twenty-first Annual Conference, ATLA, 1967, p. 127

[3]Morris, "Development Program," p. 127.

[4]Morris, "Development Program," pp. 127-129.

community to examine its library program, to understand the problems and needs of the library, to determine what needed to be done about these problems and needs, and to explore ways the library could be more effectively utilized in the educational process. Visiting teams of librarians and faculty were available to implement the program and assist the institutions in their self-studies.[5]

The program had four objectives: (1) to strengthen the book collections of the institutions by increased book expenditures; (2) to improve library operations and services; (3) to influence library expenditures as the academic community recognized the worthiness and importance of library needs; (4) to attract stronger administrative personnel to take advantage of increased opportunity and incentive.[6]

There was an increase each year in the number of institutions participating in the program: in 1961/62, seventy-nine institutions; 1962/63, eighty-two institutions; 1963/64, eighty-four institutions; 1964/65, ninety institutions; and 1965/66, ninety-eight institutions.[7]

A "normal budget" was established for each institution by averaging their expenditures for 1958/59 and 1960/61. For the five-year period, the institutions participating in the program showed an increase of $6,893,779 in total library expenditures and $4,031,973 for books and periodicals over this normal budget. There was a gain in library budgets in 1965-66 of 91.54 percent, and in book and periodical expenditures of 179.28 percent. It was estimated that over $5,000,000 could "be attributed to the impact of the Program apart from funds for building contruction or improvement of physical facilities."[8]

Critiques of Theological Education

The decade under consideration was characterized by searching appraisals of theological education by scholars. One of the most

---

[5]Morris, "Development Program," p. 127.

[6]Morris, "Development Program," p. 128.

[7]Morris, "Development Program," p. 129.

[8]Morris, "Development Program," p. 130.

significant assessments was made by Hugh T. Kerr, Professor of Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary and editor of *Theology Today*. Kerr surveyed innovative experimental programs in education at several different levels during an academic leave, 1969/1970. He indicated that he surveyed general education because "concentrated attention in the past on theological education as a special category has produced so little for such a long time."[9] The summary report of this investigation in *Theology Today* contained some valuable insights for theological education.

Kerr insisted that theological education tended to be isolated and parochial, but admitted this was true of all levels of education in general. Although there had been very little communication in the past among teachers and students on the various levels of education, Kerr indicated there was "a growing sense of common cause throughout all the ranks of education."[10]

Theological education was boring and irrelevant in too many cases; "the personal-mystical enthusiasm" that students desired most was not received because it "comes too close to subjectivism for their teachers."[11] A "colossal tug-of-war" was going on, in both general and specialized education, between "the old assumptions of academic scholarship" and the "new demands of personal involvement." Certain crucial decisions must be made immediately. The most important of these related to the basic aim of the theological seminary, and more specifically to professional training for ministry.[12] A question of priorities was forced upon theological education.

Kerr questioned whether theological education would be faithful to its dual responsibility and "give as much attention to professional training as to academic scholarship." If the academic was to continue to be the norm for theological education, "the logical future for seminaries is

---

[9]Hugh T. Kerr, "Education in General and Theological Education," *Theology Today*, 27:436, January, 1971.

[10]Kerr, "Education," p. 435. [11]Kerr, "Education," p. 443.

[12]Kerr, "Education," p. 451.

for them to become departments of religion in colleges and universities."[13] The tenor of the Kerr report may be summed up in the following statement: "The drift toward disaster, which many general educators sense and fear, seems actually to be a vigorously pursued goal for many of us in theological education."[14]

Consultation on Professional Education

In 1967 a consultation on professional education was held at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Representatives from medicine, law, business, and education were invited to discuss the educational training for their profession, and a representative of the theological field responded to each. *Theological Education as Professional Education* by Craven, Todd, and Ziegler was the report of this consultation.

The foreword of this work indicated that "theological education is being carried on today in about the same way it was done a century ago."[15] The results of studies of theological education, according to the report, had been obvious and nonradical. Other professional schools were more advanced and tended toward "a more inductive, empirical, or pragmatic methodology" than theological schools.[16]

The report indicated that future ministers were being trained "as if they were future scholars." The principal product should rather be "an educated and committed practitioner."[17] The report described the choice of faculty in theological schools:

> Faculty are chosen because of their reputation as research scholars rather than because of their reputation as churchmen or pastors, except possibly in the field of practical theology. They are not chosen because they know what students need in order to preach and minister to the community, but because they are experts in the field of study. A professor of Old Testament teaches because he is a scholar, not because he knows how to make

---

[13]Kerr, "Education," pp. 439-440. [14]Kerr, "Education," p. 436.

[15]Olga Craven, Alden L. Todd, and Jesse H. Ziegler (eds.), *Theological Education as Professional Education* (Dayton, Ohio: AATS, 1969), p. ix.

[16]Craven, pp. ix-x, 4. [17]Craven, p. 30.

> the Old Testament come alive in the parish. We don't ask whether he likes to teach in many cases, whether he cares about the ministry--but whether he is outstanding in his field.
>
> Furthermore it is generally assumed that the Doctorate is the qualifying degree for teaching in a seminary. In this respect, we make a distinction between the qualifying degree for the ministry and the qualifying degree for teaching. Not many chairs are given to those who hold the B.D. degree only. Furthermore it is assumed that promotions will be made on the basis of publication.[18]

The practice at Harvard Law School in which young teachers are promoted to the rank of full professor after spending only three years at the assistant professor rank was discussed. The law school succeeds in this procedure by "unashamedly insisting upon being primarily a professional school." There was a discussion of the practice in law schools of employing as teachers men who hold only their first professional degrees, which would be the equivalent of Master of Divinity graduates teaching in the seminary.[19]

James Gustafson, joint author of the Niebuhr report and chairman of the 1971 AATS committee to revise standards, called for teaching in the seminaries characterized by responsible scholarship and effectiveness in meeting students' needs. He advocated "rigorous criteria for judging teaching ability that are partially independent of the standard 'contribution to research in the field.'"[20] One conference participant stated:

> When it comes down to the decisions as to how the curriculum shall be developed, and how people shall teach in the seminary, it seems to me that the vital thing is that we equip people who shall be able to minister to persons, and that the education shall therefore be personally centered, rather than subject-matter centered. Everything must be done so as to approach the nonintellectual side of a person's life, to help with his total maturation for the job that he has at hand. Everything must be done to reach his motivations, to see that he knows how to go at the business of learning, of adapting, and of meeting the needs of a rapidly changing age for which no mere indoctrination could suffice.[21]

---

[18] Craven, p. 57.

[19] Craven, p. 57.

[20] Craven, p. 123.

[21] Craven, p. 136.

Reforms in Higher Education vis-à-vis Theological Education

Reform was characteristic of higher education in America in the 1960's. Prior to that period "education was almost totally limited to academic matters carried on within the conventional confines of the classroom and the curriculum."[22] Beginning with the Berkeley crisis in 1964, leaders in higher education "have sided with students who wanted to break the lock-step features of mass education, characterized by lecture-centered, textbook-centered courses," and have emphasized "a more personal form of education, in which the student takes increasing responsibility for his own education," and "learning-how-to-learn becomes a primary goal."[23]

Speaking of the sixties, the Commissioner of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare indicated that "American education has undergone over the past ten years probably the most wrenching shake-up in its history." Charges of "inefficiency, unresponsiveness, and aloofness from the great issues of our society, perhaps even lack of interest in these issues," were brought against education. He indicated that "educational reform at all levels is now the intent of all responsible educators."[24]

Calling for even more sweeping change, he said:

> . . . let us set aside the traditional boundaries of learning, the days, the hours, the bells, the schedules. Let us find ways to free ourselves from administrative strangleholds on what teaching should be and what teachers should be . . . . Above all, let our schools be humane once more. . . . teachers want to bring excitement to the class room. They want to bring fulfillment to the lives of the children in their charge. But to achieve excitement and fulfillment in the classroom, teachers need a new freedom from administrative protocol and an

---

[22]U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *The Commissioner's Annual Report* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 1.

[23]James R. Kennedy, Jr., Thomas E. Kirk and Gwendolyn A. Weaver, "Course-related Library Instruction: a Case Study of the English and Biology Departments at Earlham College, *Drexel Library Quarterly*, 7:278, July and October, 1971.

[24]H.E.W. Commissioner, p. 2.

> increased competence in reaching each learner and touching his life deeply and compassionately . . . let us find ways for teachers to concern themselves wholly with students.[25]

Theological education felt the impact and responded to this educational revolution. Jesse H. Ziegler, executive director of AATS, indicated that there was in 1970 "a major shift in emphasis and direction of theological education," a "very significant shift in focus to education for ministry." He says:

> Whether one thinks of it as a shift from academically-oriented to professionally-oriented education, or from that which is based in the classical past to that which finds its direction in the contemporary, it is clear that the phrase which best describes where theological education is bound is "Education for Ministry."[26]

Zeigler indicated that the theological education of the future will be based on sound educational theory; it will utilize productive relationships and all aspects of community life.[27]

AATS Actions

Two actions by AATS in 1971 indicated better and more relevant developments in store for libraries. One of these was the proposed standards and procedures for accrediting theological degree programs, and the other was the establishment of a committee to study theological libraries.

In November, 1971, a draft of the report of the Committee to Revise Standards and Procedures for Accrediting was published by AATS. Hearings based on the draft were held in various regions of North America in January and February of 1972, and written comments by individuals were invited. The report was revised on the basis of this feedback. The revised report which was published April 1, 1972, was to be presented for discussion and adoption at the biennial meeting of AATS in June, 1972.

---

[25] H.E.W. Commissioner, pp. 4-5.

[26] Jesse H. Ziegler, "Shaping Education for the Ministry in the 1970's," *Lexington Theological Quarterly*, 6:29, April, 1971.

[27] Ziegler, pp. 30-36.

These proposed standards represent a drastic change in accrediting procedure, since their purpose is "to provide criteria primarily for the judgment of the quality of degree programs, rather than primarily for the judgment of individual institutional resources."[28]

The first draft noted two changes in AATS and theological education since the previous standards and procedures were written: (1) the AATS included Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Jewish schools in its membership, and (2) "theological education is in a time of unprecedented experimentation in curriculum, teaching methods and procedures, and organizational arrangements."[29] The AATS also approved the appointment of a joint AATS-ATLA committee to make a thorough study of theological libraries.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

The literature of theological education continued to sound like a broken record, as scholar after scholar repeated, with variations, themes first propounded by Kelly in 1924. Near the very end of the period, there was a very decided shift in emphasis in AATS toward truly professional training in ministry. The accrediting standards proposed by the committee on accrediting showed promise of doing what no other force had been able to do: completely revolutionize the structure and purpose of theological education.

Critiques of Theological Education

Voices from within the ranks of theological educators continued the searching appraisal characteristic of theological education.

Miller. Samuel H. Miller, John Lord O'Brien Professor of Divinity and Dean of the Divinity School at Harvard, indicated that the age of the early 1960's was characterized by insecurity and the "accelerated rapidity

---

[28]AATS, *Draft of a Report of the Committee to Revise Standards and Procedures for Accrediting* (Dayton, Ohio: AATS, 1971), p. iii.

[29]AATS, *Draft*, p. 1.

of incessant change," contrasting sharply with the previous age in which the elevation of technical reason had caused the sense of certainty to be prized as a virtue. While other professional schools were making radical changes in response to societal change, theological education plodded in its familiar worn ruts. Despite improved standards, theological education had been "the last of the professional fields either to feel the force of the modern revolution or to be willing to acknowledge it." All the surveys in theology according to Miller, had resulted in

> . . . no fundamental breakthrough to a new vision of how to prepare a minister to cope with the twentieth century, either in the tranquilized church or the terrified world. We are superb at the study of origins, excellent at unraveling history, erudite in matters of the past, sharp in analysis of ancient manuscripts, utterly fantastic in research--but how to get a man set up to function creatively in the service of humanity precisely under the conditions presented by the church and the world today is another matter.[30]

Miller questioned whether theological education could be reformed and whether anyone dares to claim that these things that have happened in every other field have no relevance for theological schools. He questioned whether men should be prepared for the ministry as though the church is going to or ought to remain unchanged.[31]

Miller made three basic suggestions he believed would enter into reordering the task of theological education. "In the first place, theological disciplines must break out of their sacred isolation and meet modern man where he is now living."[32] Theological education could not afford either isolationism or monasticism. It had to be concerned with all the aspects of human life, with the whole man.

"Secondly, theological schools must recognize no terminal point in the training of the ministry."[33] The thought that the curriculum of a theological seminary could completely prepare a man for an on-going ministry in our world today was ridiculous, according to Miller. Thirdly,

---

[30]Samuel H. Miller, "Education for Insecurity," *The Harvard Divinity Bulletin*, 29:29-30, October, 1964.

[31]Miller, p. 30.

[32]Miller, p. 30.

[33]Miller, p. 30.

> . . . whatever integrity there is in the gospel, whatever continuity and perennial reality, we must prepare ourselves for deliberate flexible innovation in a rapidly changing context of culture and society.[34]

Alexander. James E. Alexander listed five flaws he saw in theological education. He considered the first flaw to be an outdated structure. "From an educational standpoint, the underlying philosophy of the seminary is a hundred or more years behind that of the colleges and universities."[35]

He cited the following quote from *The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States* by Richard Hofstadter and C. DeWitt Hardy in 1952:[36]

> Knowledge was thought of as a certain more or less fixed quantum of truth, and the primary function of education to get as much as possible of this corpus of Christian truth into the heads of the undergraduates.

Although this statement was applied by these two authors to the early American college, Alexander indicated that the reader will

> . . . immediately recognize it as quite descriptive of today's theological seminary also. The seminary is a "filling station" wherein the student, in three or four years, is pumped full of a lifetime supply of ecclesiastical fuel.[37]

Contending that the only change in theological education had been the addition of new subjects and courses, the writer quoted Richard Niebuhr's statement in 1954 that the seminary curriculum would have to be

---

[34]Miller, p. 30.

[35]James E. Alexander, "New Formulas for Theological Education," *Religion in Life*, 35:32, Winter, 1965-66. (Alexander is a graduate of the University of the Pacific and Boston University. He served as TRAFCO chairman for the San Francisco area, and as lecturer at the University of the Pacific. At the time this article was written, he was engaged in further study in New Testament at Claremont Graduate School.)

[36]Alexander, p. 32, citing Richard Hofstadter and C. DeWitt Hardy, *The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), p. 14.

[37]Alexander, p. 32.

extended to an estimated seven and one-half years to give full attention to all the special-interest groups clamoring for attention.

The root of the problem, according to Alexander, was a philosophical one and was a battle "between *terminal* and *continuing* education." Theological education failed to develop students who were independent, life-long inquirers, because it sought to "complete knowledge rather than to introduce it." The fundamental problem was that "the goal of independent, life-long inquiry is essentially incompatible with a concept of education which presupposes the possibility of turning out a finished product."[38]

In the second place, theological education was inefficient. The seminary curriculum tried to cover too much ground by applying a theological interpretation to other disciplines and to teach them its own way, rather than allowing the student to take courses in these particular disciplines within the university setting. This created a good deal of duplication and parallelism for a student who had been trained in the liberal arts.[39]

In the third place, theological education penalized the serious student because of its tendency to accept students with minimum preparation. The theological faculty could not presume the seminary student had an adequate foundation upon which to build theological insight, so "the curriculum is thus reduced to the lowest common denominator." The student who had specialized in religion in his undergraduate training was forced by various means to take the same courses. A further aspect of this tragic circumstance was that the students who went along with the system were favored while those who did not were rejected, and in many cases, left the seminary and the ministry.[40]

In the fourth and fifth places, theological education was wasteful because of duplication and parallelism between the seminary curriculum and the undergraduate school. The minister was left at a social disadvantage because he still had only a bachelor's degree after spending a minimum of seven years on the academic treadmill, while his compatriots of other

---

[38]Alexander, pp. 33-34.

[39]Alexander, p. 34.

[40]Alexander, p. 35.

professions, who had spent less time in training, had master's and doctor's degrees.[41]

Coburn and Boyd. John B. Coburn, former Dean of the Episcopal Theological Seminary, quoted an address by the Dean of the Harvard Medical School in 1961 concerning medical education, substituting the words "theological" for "medical" and "minister" for "physician" as follows:

> . . . theological education is good only when it is good education. Thus, it is preferable to send theological students into the . . . world knowing less, but understanding better how to learn . . . . If they have not learned while in theological school how to learn, they never will. And to be a good minister today requires that learning continue for life.[42]

Malcolm Boyd, Chaplain, The Episcopal Mission to Wayne State University in Detroit, contended that the seminary is most successful when it enables a man "to start asking at least some of the right questions." He asserted that answers were being handed out in seminaries to many questions that had not been raised, and the right questions never seemed to be asked at all, barring the possibility the right questions would be answered correctly. He contended, "a man should be commencing rather than ending his learning process when he graduates from a theological seminary.[43]

Howe. Reuel L. Howe, Director of the Institute for Pastoral Studies in Bloomfield, Michigan, made a plea in 1964 that theological education become dialogical. It was Howe's contention that the average minister saw himself as one who was supposed to have and give "the answers," and that often the answers he gave were to questions that had not been asked. Howe thought the minister's image of the teacher as answer-giver inhibited his ability to think theologically about life. The inaccurate view of their own authority that seminary graduates had received from

---

[41]Alexander, pp. 36-38.

[42]John B. Coburn, *Minister: Man-in-the-Middle* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), p. 111.

[43]Malcolm Boyd, "Prophets and Promoters?" *The Making of Ministers*, eds. Keith R. Bridston and Dwight W. Culver (Minneapolis: Augusburg, 1964), p. 229.

theological training crippled their ability to help people discover the answers to their own questions.[44]

The church exists for dialogue with the world, and the purpose of theological education is to train ministers to facilitate this dialogue. Since ministers seem unable to really communicate with laity, but merely tell them monologically what to know and believe,

> . . . we should change the purpose of our teaching from that of transmitting knowledge about the faith to training men for action in the faith. People should know the gospel, not for the sake of possessing that knowledge, but in order that they may live it.

The principle of dialogue needed to be employed to reform the theological teacher's role of knowledge transmitter.[45]

The application of this principle of dialogue would produce a different kind of graduate who would (1) feel as much at home in the world as the classroom; (2) be able to communicate with people; (3) be more interested in life than religion; and (4) be able to resist clericalizing influences. Dialogical education would enable the student to understand life and enter into meaningful dialogue with the world. The minister who does not know how to enter into this meaningful dialogue is unable to help people understand what they are accepting when they accept the Christian faith, or what they are rejecting when they reject it. Many ministers were unhappy simply because of this flaw in their theological training.[46]

Feilding. The following statement is representative of the incisive critique of theological education by Charles R. Feilding, Professor of Moral Theology at Trinity College, Toronto, in *Education for Ministry*, published by AATS in 1966: "The greater part of the whole theological enterprise seems . . . to be off on a vast archaeological dig, preoccupied with long ago, and largely oblivious of the purpose of the expedition."[47] Feilding indicated the educational philosophy of theological schools was

---

[44]Reuel L. Howe, "Theological Education and the Image of the Ministry," *The Making of Ministers*, eds. Keith R. Bridston and Dwight W. Culver (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1964), pp. 213-214.

[45]Howe, pp. 220-223.

[46]Howe, pp. 223-224, 226

[47]Charles R. Feilding, *Education for Ministry* (Dayton, Ohio: AATS, 1966), p. 10.

preoccupied with the transmission of knowledge, whereas it should be involved "in helping students to gain insight and to develop understanding."[48]

Pusey and Taylor. Nathan M. Pusey, President of Harvard, and Charles L. Taylor, former Director of AATS, authored in 1967 *Ministry for Tomorrow,* the report of a special committee on theological education for the Episcopal church. The authors contended that the *professional* education of ministers is the primary purpose of theological schools.[49] They referred to a new philosophy that liberated medical schools "from the lock step of conformity that has regimented them for fifty years." This philosophy was characterized by a concern that the student be mature, well motivated, intelligent, and capable of accepting more responsibility for his own education.[50] Contemporary education produced many stunted wills that were incapable of greatness, not owing to lack of ability, but to lack of exposure to what is noble, generous, and faith-provoking.[51]

Bennett and Golterman. John C. Bennett, President of Union Theological Seminary, asserted that each student generation must encounter the original sources anew and afresh "in the light of what the intervening generations have thought about them." He denied that the theological seminary has "Christian truth in capsules of doctrine to be passed on from the past to the present or from the faculty to the students."[52] Bennett saw continuing education as a way to ease the strain on both the student's time and the institution's resources.[53]

---

[48]Feilding, p. 107.

[49]Nathan M. Pusey and Charles L. Taylor, *Ministry for Tomorrow* (New York: Seabury, 1967), p. 121.

[50]Pusey, p. 121, citing Peter V. Lee in a paper for the congregation at the Episcopal Theological School, January, 1967, p. 6.

[51]Pusey, p. 121, citing W. E. Hocking, *Human Nature and Its Remaking* (New Haven: Yale University, 1923), pp. 259-260.

[52]John C. Bennett, "Priorities in Theological Education," *Christianity and Crisis,* 29:88, April 14, 1969.

[53]Bennett, p. 89.

S. I. Golterman, Assistant Executive Secretary of the Board of Higher Education of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, emphasized that theological education must provide an environment in which the proper dispositions, attitudes, loyalties, and commitments could be developed and altered in students. The student as a whole person must be given careful consideration. Intelligence could no longer be regarded as "academic knowledge" and moral growth and general maturation must be combined with the cognitive growth of students. This aim was compatible with graduate education.[54]

Shaull. Richard Shaull, Professor of Ecumenics at Princeton Theological Seminary, and contributing editor of *Christianity and Crisis*, conveyed a sense of despair concerning the present and future of theological education in a critical indictment of it in 1969. Education could and should be an exciting adventure in understanding the world and reality, self-discovery, and personal and social liberation, but it was exactly the opposite. Most education was concerned with its program of study instead of the needs and interests of students. The educational experience of the student was oppressive and alienating, guiding him toward adjustment and conformity rather than freedom and creativity.[55]

The real situation and the students' questions were ignored, and there was no moving ahead into a dialogue with the experience of the historical faith community. Shaull stated that

> . . . by and large, the seminary assumes the given structures of higher education--in spite of the crisis evident there--and functions according to the rules of modern bureaucracy without raising serious questions.[56]

He indicated he found it easier to "become involved in significant learning and teaching processes outside the seminary structure."[57]

---

[54]S. I. Golterman, "The Future of Theological Education," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 39:605-606, October, 1968.

[55]Richard Shaull, "The Challenge to the Seminary," *Christianity and Crisis*, 29:83, April 14, 1969.

[56]Shaull, p. 84.

[57]Shaull, p. 84.

According to Shaull, some students simply conformed to the process, did fairly good academic work, "but show little independent judgment or imagination, and offer little hope of providing the leadership the church desperately needs today." Another group discovered what was happening to them and rebelled by either leaving the seminary or becoming so involved in trying to change it that it was difficult for them to concentrate on their studies. The great majority, who were somewhere in between, were "in the process of discovering who they are in relation to the dynamics of the world and the educational process that shaped them." They became overwhelmed by their identity crisis because the seminary did very little to help them, and very often they were "not free to engage fully in a new learning process.[58]

Klemt. Klemt hailed a recommendation presented to AATS in 1968 calling for ecumenical clusters of seminaries in metropolitan areas near large state universities as the culmination of a movement begun at the first meeting of AATS in 1918. He contended that a study of AATS minutes and actions "shows a consistent effort by AATS to lead seminaries away from an instructional form or method of education toward forms and methods that freed the students for education through their own discoveries."[59]

Instruction, according to Klemt, implies the building up of passive students by a professor "pouring in structure," but "discovery" implies an educational technique that "seeks to enable the student to 'uncover,' to reconnoiter, to explore for himself." The seminaries, however, had been slow to accept the discovery approach or to recognize the importance of the library in it. Therefore, it was twenty-eight years after the founding of AATS before ATLA was begun, and progress in library improvement had been slow since that time.[60]

The theology of a seminary correlates with its academic method and influences its need for and willingness to have a good library. In the past, because of the instruction-oriented educational process, a fine library was not needed. In fact, "more than a few well-chosen books would

---

[58]Shaull, p. 84.

[59]Klemt, p. 357.

[60]Klemt, pp. 357-358, 361.

only create confusion and dissension." The discovery method, on the other hand, demands a fine library. The good libraries historically had been the ones "at seminaries located in metropolitan areas contiguous to a large university, and generally of an inter-denominational character."[61] Klemt stated:

> Hence, the fine theological library is a child of, but also a parent of, this theological and educational moment. One result of the current AATS push for ecumenical clusters of seminaries, located in metropolitan centers, contiguous to a large university, will be that the library at last will come into its own. In this new situation, the library should find itself very much at home. As the AATS continues its call for the "discovery" method of theological education, the library will be needed as never before.[62]

Kerr. The teacher and his teaching, according to Kerr, held the center of attention in theological education, but "the real problem in education today is not teaching and the teacher but learning and the student. The big question is not how to teach but who the student is and how he learns."[63] Previously, the central question had been "content-oriented: 'what is education?'" but now, "high school, college, university, and graduate students are asking a different kind of question: 'what is education for?'"[64] Kerr insisted he was not "talking about relaxing academic scholarship," but that he was "talking about 'full equality of educational opportunity.'" He stated that "graduate-professional schools must re-appraise their goals *so that academic standards serve rather than dominate* the whole educational program."[65]

A Shift in Emphasis

The shift in emphasis and direction from academically oriented to professionally oriented theological education in 1970 was an indication that a considerable number of theological educators had heard and heeded

---

[61]Klemt, pp. 362-363. [62]Klemt, pp. 363.

[63]Kerr, pp. 445, 447; see B. F. Skinner, "Why Teachers Fail," *Saturday Review*, October 16, 1965, p. 80, and Ohmer Milton, "Teaching or Learning?" Research Report No. 6, American Association for Higher Education, 1971, p. 2.

[64]Kerr, *Education*, p. 434. [65]Kerr, *Education*, p. 441.

the voices calling for reform. It remains to be seen whether this shift in emphasis will be any more than a revision of lecture notes, the addition of field education requirements, and emphasis on engagement in ministry by the theological student, or an attempt to fully utilize all the resources of theological schools.

Proposed AATS Standards

Although the Committee to Revise Standards and Procedures for Accrediting carefully avoided writing prevailing or new concepts of ministry into the standards to be proposed to AATS in June, 1972, the emphasis of the standards is upon professional training for ministry, and is student-centered. There is a shift toward student initiative and cooperation.

Facilitation of student learning. Each of the eleven goals and objectives for the Master of Divinity degree began with the word "develop" in the first draft.[66] The revised report designates specific abilities which students are to acquire.[67] This implies the process of assisting the student in his development. "The achievement of professional competence rather than the accumulation of credits or passing of time" is to determine the completion of the Doctor of Ministries Degree.[68] If these standards reflect an educational philosophy, it includes an emphasis upon the educational process as facilitating student learning, rather than authoritarian figures pouring content into passive vessels.

Competence in bibliographic skills. The standards indicate that the "optimum use" of the theological library program's financial resources is to be evaluated in terms of how the program assists students to secure "skills and materials necessary for the continuing performance of their respective professions." The library's program is to include

---

[66] AATS, *Draft*, p. 6.

[67] AATS, *Revised Report of the Committee to Revise Standards and Procedures for Accrediting* (Dayton, Ohio: AATS, 1972), p. 14.

[68] AATS, *Draft*, p. 14, *Revised*, p. 8.

instruction in the use of the library's resources, "particularly the bibliographic tools which are essential to independent study and research."[69]

TEACHING METHOD OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

The comments of theological educators on theological education continued the repetitive theme that teaching in theological schools was a monological conveying of information. A student delivered a blistering attack on the lecture method, and one scholar sought to draw attention away from the teacher, teaching, and content to focus on the learner, learning, and the actual needs of students. Standards proposed by AATS called for educational training for those preparing to teach and more independent, self-directed learning by students.

Critiques of Teaching Method

A number of theological educators were calling for radical revision of the teaching approach. The lecture method continued to be the favorite target of the critics.

Howe. In his call for dialogical education, Howe declared that theological education was most often a monologue in which the authoritarian teacher delivered what is primarily a one-way transfer of answers to passive students.[70]

Feilding. Feilding indicated that teaching was often reduced "to the bare level of conveying information." Although he said little about libraries, he made the statement that "often the direct transmission of information is better left to the printed page or to other means."[71] He stated that "a cynic who observed that theology is learned to pass examinations would not be far wrong." Theology often came alive after graduation from seminary because a student was exposed to a new learning

---

[69]AATS, *Draft*, pp. 3-4; *Revised*, p. 8.

[70]Howe, p. 214.

[71]Feilding, p. 107.

experience, but "the theology discovered . . . is seldom related to the one taught earlier in the school."[72] Theological education should seek to develop powers of critical thought in students that would enable them to deal with a variety of situations and prepare them to be life-long learners.[73]

According to Feilding, the lecture method occupied an unreasonable number of hours in the theological schools. The lecture method led the student to allow the professor to do his thinking and "to assume from the model that verbal facility in the analysis of intellectual problems is an adequate preparation for pastoral ministry." The student who had been encouraged to let the professor do his thinking for him was "a poor risk even as an intellectual leader and is ill prepared for the necessary continuance of his own education."[74]

Feilding listed the following reasons for continued use of the lecture: it is easiest and cheapest to maintain, requires less administrative and architectural planning, costs less to house, offers a substitute for lack of books in the library, requires less staff, is a method which appears most easily to cover the curriculum, and requires from the lecturer a minimum of emotional strength. Whatever the good points of the lecture method, "it is easy to misuse because it does no apparent harm and leaves both lecturer and student with an illusion of satisfaction unlikely to be dispelled until after graduation."[75]

Pusey and Taylor. Pusey and Taylor indicated that the instructional method was the basic problem in education for ministry. They denied that moving from content-centered to student-centered education, as they recommended, would result in any diminishing of intellectual vigor or so damage the academic standards that the knowledge of the seminary graduate would be inadequate. To the contrary, intellectual vigor and academic scholarship would increase. The authors contended that current teaching methods "provide for many students only the rudiments of knowledge, and, far worse, sometimes give him the impression that as he leaves his school, he has graduated rather than commenced."[76]

---

[72]Feilding, pp. 30-31.

[73]Feilding, p. 110.

[74]Feilding, p. 110.

[75]Feilding, p. 110.

[76]Pusey, p. 123.

Robert McAfee Brown, Theological Consultant of Study, Union Theological Seminary, New York, wrote of a theological revolution going on in the church which "must come alive in the seminary. This means an end to merely textbook theology."[77]

Bennett. Bennett suggested that "faculties need to reconsider all of their methods of teaching" and that they need to be "freed from the idea that if they do not cover ground in a basic course by lecturing on it, it is not officially ocvered." He indicated the faculty should be free to lecture on the aspects of their subject where they could make their best contribution rather than abandon the lecture method altogether. He stated that "no one can more easily get into a rut than a professor on tenure."[78]

Deering. Some writers, such as Ronald F. Deering, Associate Librarian and Director of Reader Services at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, were suggesting that people could learn more efficiently by reading, listening, and viewing in the library than in a classroom lecture, and that the content-lecture method was an inefficient manner of imparting knowledge compared with extensive and widespread reading.[79]

Seely. Paul H. Seely, a student at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, maintained that the lecture as used in theological education was detrimental to serious scholarship because it exalted conditioned response and depreciated man. Genuine education was annulled when the professor did creative research and handed the results on a platter to students. If the lecture method led the student to do creative research by communicating enthusiasm, interest, and motivation, it would be acceptable. However, stated Seely, "the average lecture is about as stimulating as a day of drizzle."[80]

---

[77]Robert McAfee Brown, "The Seminary in a Time of Revolution," *Essays in Ministry*, ed. the Staff of the Fund for Theological Education (Princeton, N.J.: The Fund for Theological Education, 1967), p. 48.

[78]Bennett, p. 89.

[79]Ronald F. Deering, "Library Service in the Theological Seminary: Today and Tomorrow," *Review and Expositor*, 65:212, Spring, 1968.

[80]Paul H. Seely, "The Lecture and Superficial Scholarship,"

acceptable. However, stated Seely, "the average lecture is about as stimulating as a day of drizzle."[80]

Seely claimed the lecture was popular with teachers because it was an easy way to teach, exalted the lecturer, and its noise and activity made it seem that learning was taking place. Mimeographed notes would be more effective than the lecture because of the fallibility and weakness of the listeners. Inattention, errors in transcribing foreign phrases, proper nouns, and new thoughts, plus handwriting illegibility and the concentration necessary to record the lecturer's notes militated against understanding the lecture. Every hour spent using the lecture method was an hour of study lost and a vote against genuine scholarship and education. According to Seely, the average professor teaching twelve credit hours wastes over $10,000 annually.[81] He stated:

> We look for the students to do creative research, real thinking, and problem solving. Train a person like this, and there is hope for scholarship. But this approach that presents the ready-made answers to be crammed, regurgitated, marked with B, and popped into the oven must go. How long will men be given honors for having the highest percentage of Pavlovian responses at exam time? How long will men be treated as machines, fitted into a pre-determined curriculum indifferent to their backgrounds or goals, tested only to see if the professor's viewpoint has had a "take," asked only for standard answers that can be easily graded? The lecture method of teaching treats men as machines. It is sinful and detrimental to scholarship. We cannot ask them merely for mental assent to these propositions; we demand repentance.[82]

Shaull. Shaull charged that theological education was dominated by traditional teaching methods stressing knowledge-impartation and content-transmission.[83] The lecture method predominated. Problems were defined by the teacher, and knowledge was bestowed on the students. Success in theological schools consisted in mastering a body of knowledge in a given field. The professor defined the issues and determined the ways they were to be examined, even in the preceptorials and seminars.[84]

---

[80]Paul H. Seely, "The Lecture and Superficial Scholarship," *Theological Education*, 4:619, Winter, 1968.

[81]Seely, pp. 619-621. [82]Seely, pp. 621-622.

[83]Shaull, p. 83. [84]Shaull, p. 84.

Klemt. Klemt's conception of the theological teaching method was that of professors pouring content into passive students who should be freed for education through their own discoveries.[85]

Leuba. According to Clarence J. Leuba, a popular image of a 1968 college was an institution consisting of teachers who poured learning into students. This imparting of knowledge was achieved mainly through lectures, and a truly great teacher was one who could inspire learning by his contagious enthusiasm. Libraries, laboratories, counselors, extra-curricular activities, and section meetings existed, but "the prevailing view of higher education is one in which an inspired professor, busily lecturing, is the heart of it all." He contended this aged concept was no longer considered valid, "or even desirable by serious students of the educational process." Among these students, Leuba stated, "it is now accepted as a truism that *it is not possible to teach anyone anything; it is only possible to arrange things so that one can learn.*"[86] Leuba insisted the true faculty member was no longer a teacher, but an educational manager, an educational counselor, and a specialist in subject matter, library, testing, and audiovisual aids.[87]

Kerr. The curricular set-up of professional schools, including theological education, had been too rigid and authoritarian, according to Kerr. "It almost seems that the higher up the ladder of education you climb, the less possibility there is for innovative methods or learning experimentation." Reference was then made to the major studies of theological education since the one by Kelly, with the indication that these "have deplored the stranglehold of the lecture system and the lack of student independent study."[88]

---

[85]Klemt, p. 357.

[86]Clarence J. Leuba, "Thoughts on an Ideal College," *The Library-College Journal*, 1:39-40, Winter, 1968.

[87]Leuba, p. 40.

[88]Hugh T. Kerr, "Seminarians and Self-directed Study," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, 64:71, March, 1971.

Kerr asserted that unquestionably "education would be better in many ways if more attention were directed to teaching and to methods for improving teaching effectiveness." He cautioned, however, that "the purpose of teaching within the whole process of education" needed to be made clear. He queried:

> Are we trying to find new and better ways for continuing the traditional authoritarian method of telling, training, inculcating, and indoctrination? Are we thinking of teaching as transmitting? Is learning receiving? Must education be teacher-subject oriented? Is teaching telling? Is learning listening?[89]

Almost any teaching method will be sufficient "if teaching is primarily the passing on of the western intellectual and cultural tradition, and if the test of effectiveness is measured by some sort of student examination or paper."[90] However, there had been an astonishing neglect of teaching methodology in theological education. Kerr asserted:

> Teaching is apparently a skill, art, craft, profession for which there is no special training outside the mastering of one's discipline. In graduate schools, where most teachers for higher education are trained, it is rare to find any instruction whatever in teaching methods or learning theory. It is a safe bet that very few theological professors have ever studied teaching-learning theory, or have ever read any educational literature, or have attended any educational conferences, or have ever been video-taped in class, or have ever had their teaching evaluated in any way at all.[91]

Proposed AATS Standards

Though teaching methods were not specifically delineated in the proposed AATS standards, adherence to them would affect the teaching approach of the faculty. Instruction is held accountable for "the reality of the student as a person." Emphasis is placed on interdisciplinary teaching in the context of ministry. One of the things that instruction should provide for the Doctor of Ministry degree is "movement from dependence on residency and instruction by others toward more independent, self-directed learning in actual ministerial situations."[92]

---

[89] Kerr, *Education*, p. 446.

[90] Kerr, *Education*, p. 446.

[91] Kerr, *Education*, p. 445.

[92] AATS, *Draft*, pp. 13, 15; *Revised*, p. 23.

The complaint of many theological educators that the faculty in theological schools lacked training in education underscores the significance of the following statement concerning the standard for the teaching-research doctoral degrees:

> The doctoral program should provide opportunity for instruction in educational methodology, learning theory, and the development of skill as a teacher. This element in the doctoral program should be integral to the whole. To this end, institutions should develop teaching assistantship programs for all doctoral students. Such programs should include opportunities for teaching under supervision by senior graduate faculty whose responsibility will encompass both scholarly interests and teaching ability.[93]

LIBRARIES

Libraries received tremendous attention during the sixties, and growth was rapid. The salaries and status of librarians rose dramatically. The revolution in higher education began to have an impact on theological education. There was a growing polarization among theological educators concerning the library's role. AATS actions began to have a revolutionary impact on theological libraries.

Library Development Program

An excellent assessment of the impact of the Library Development Program was given by Morris at the ATLA meeting in 1967:

> Not only was an institution made more conscious of the library's place in the school, but it became better informed of the needs of the library and the problems faced by it. In some instances the library programs were drastically altered because of recommendations of the visitors. In others building programs, or modifications of building programs which had lain dormant or which had not been previously envisioned, were given an impetus because of the visit. Notable gifts for books and endowments for library purposes were attributed to the impact of the Library Development Program.[94]

Morris felt the program had demonstrated that, if the seminaries were to gain the strength needed for the task that lay ahead, it was imperative for them to regroup and realign and, whenever possible, relate,

---

[93] AATS, *Draft*, p. 29; see *Revised*, p. 36.

[94] Morris, "Program," p. 133.

> . . . in an integral way in situations which can provide the resources and leadership necessary for cross-cultural, inter-disciplinary and other educational programs which must be employed to make theological education, and, in turn, the leadership of the Church effective in today's world.[95]

The final sentence of Morris' report states:

> If there is anything that the ATLA Library Development Program has made unmistakably clear, it is that neither the small institution, nor the stronger institution standing alone, can provide the library resources and services such as theological education in the generation ahead will require.[96]

Each institution that participated fully for the five years of the program spent $30,000 for books and periodicals over and above the "normal" book budget. The book and periodical expenditures compared to the overall budget suggest that the increases in salary and staff services were not communsurate with the improvement in book collections.[97]

Salaries and Status

Substantial raises in salaries for librarians in the member schools of AATS during this period indicate that these institutions were beginning to understand the role, importance, and need of librarians. *The Monthly Staff Report and Bulletin of Information* for January, 1960 reported that librarians ranked below instructors in the maximum professorial salary table.[98] The monthly report for April, 1962 indicated that the greatest percentage increase in salaries, when the figures for 1960/61 were compared with those for 1958/59, was in salaries for the head librarian.

The comments that precede the tables of salaries, however, indicated the median salary for librarians in accredited schools was $6,860, which was 16 percent lower than in colleges and universities, though 16 percent higher than two years before. The summary of this report indicated that the most unfavorable comparisons with the college and university

---

[95]Morris, "Program," p. 138. [96]Morris, "Program," p. 138.

[97]Morris, "Program," p. 130.

[98]AATS, "Monthly Staff Report and Bulletin of Information," January, 1960.

salaries were at the full professor rank and the librarian position. The report concluded that although librarians' salaries showed the highest percentage of increase in accredited schools (16 percent), greater increases were needed to compete with colleges and universities.[99]

Whereas colleges and universities were paying their librarians a little more than associate professors, theological schools were paying their librarians less than assistant professors.[100] Although librarians' salaries increased significantly, there was still a discrepancy when compared with the salaries the colleges and universities were paying, making it apparent how poorly paid librarians have been historically.

The bulletin of March 13, 1964, was the third biennial study of salaries following the analysis in *The Advancement of Theological Education*. The bulletin indicated the salaries of librarians had increased approximately 16 percent at all theological schools, but still were 18.7 percent under the corresponding salaries in colleges and universities. The report stated additional salary increases would be required to attract and hold capable library personnel, and notable increases in librarians' salaries were needed to merely keep pace with colleges and universities.[101]

The biennial salary report in the January, 1966 AATS Bulletin stated that in the accredited schools, librarians had received a 17.9 percent increase in the biennium, almost exactly the difference two years previous between seminary and college or university librarians' salaries. This was a higher rate of change than for teaching faculty members. The median salary in accredited schools was $8,520 for librarians, $8,172 for assistant professors, and $9,209 for associate professors. Full professors ranked closest to librarians in percentage of increase with 14.8 percent.[102] However, since the percentage increase for professors was based on a much larger original amount than for librarians, it is apparent that librarians' salaries did not gain very much.

---

[99]AATS, "Salaries in Theological Schools," April, 1962.

[100]AATS, "Salaries in Theological Schools."

[101]AATS, "Salaries of Instructional Staff and Library Staff in Theological Schools," March 13, 1964.

[102]AATS, "Salaries in AATS Schools: A Biennial Report," January, 1966.

An undated mimeographed report covering the 1964/65 school year for approximately 124 AATS schools included a section on library staffs. Ninety accredited schools reported on their policies concerning faculty status (as defined by the school) for library personnel as follows: chief librarian only, 64; all professional staff, 9; selected staff, 7; no staff, 11. The chief librarian had no other responsibilities in twenty-nine of these schools, but thirty-one reported teaching responsibilities ranging from one to ten hours per week and/or summer school. Other librarian responsibilities listed included public relations, choir director, chaplain, school marshal, dean of residence, and twelve others. No mention was made of the librarian's relationship to the curriculum committee.[103] The preceding information indicated that librarians' salaries were increasing steadily, though still below par, and that approximately 90 percent of accredited schools granted faculty status to the librarian.

Amendment to Library Standards

The twenty-seventh bulletin of the AATS (1966) contained an upward revision of library standards. The minimal budget required in terms of 1965 dollars was $19,000 per year total budget or $95 per student and faculty member, whichever was greater, exclusive of janitorial service and maintenance. Not less that $7,500 was to be spent on books and periodicals apart from binding.[104]

Mid-1960 Trends

Pusey and Taylor predicted in 1967 that the teaching function and the importance of the library would increase because of: greater freedom for student self-learning, the growth of dialogical teaching, less reliance by teachers upon textbook assignments and reserve books, the increase of papers demanding research, the introduction of continuing education for the clergy, and provision for extensive lay education.[105]

---

[103] AATS, "A Statistical Profile of the Theological Libraries of AATS Schools," undated.

[104] AATS, *Bulletin 27*, 1966, p. 28.

[105] Pusey, p. 82.

Polarization of Theological Educators

This period witnessed a polarization between the proponents of the library-as-heart-of-the-institution and those who would subordinate it. Deering saw the theological seminary as a charismatic and inspiration center as well as an education center. However, he stated that

> . . . insofar as it is an educational center, I believe that it will have to share in this turn of the campus to the library as a central, and perhaps preeminent teaching and learning resource of the school of the future.[106]

Nothing can substitute for a capable classroom teacher in inspiring and motivating students, "answering problems and solving difficulties, providing basic framework, guiding and directing, and testing the learning process." The library does seem to be a superior resource for imparting knowledge. The teacher should inspire, guide, and direct the educational process, but utilize library resources more fully in the process.[107] Deering stated that "the library follows the curriculum and educational method of the school. It does not mold the curriculum and educational methods"[108] However, the storehouse concept of the library and the custodial view of librarianship "must once for all be laid to rest if the library of today and tomorrow is to be an educational function rather than a bibliothecal museum."[109]

This view contrasts very sharply with the role of the library envisioned in the report of the Curriculum Task Force of the Resources Planning Commission of the AATS in the Spring, 1968 issue of *Theological Education*. Very little was said in the report about libraries. What was said assigned the library a very minimal role in theological education.

The report stated that since it is important that students "learn about how the multiple library facilities in any metropolitan setting can be utilized by the professional minister" and how to "function productively when a 'seminary' library is not easily available . . . the library of the center could be minimal." The library should concentrate in periodicals and "certain minimal basic resources." A nucleus library, public

---

[106] Deering, p. 212.

[107] Deering, p. 212.

[108] Deering, p. 214.

[109] Deering, p. 213.

libraries, and a growing personal library are to be the resources for the student of the seventies.[110] Students should have ready access to media and ephemeral materials. The report states "We would expect the pattern of learning here proposed would involve much wider use of a variety of contemporary resources than has been the case in the past." This is to be accomplished through duplicating facilities, changes in library reference catalogs, and new library filing procedures and facilities.[111]

Maria Grossman, the librarian at Andover Harvard and president of ATLA, charged that in the report "the library appears as an unimportant and minor item in the proposed curriculum of theological education." She quoted statements in the report that "the whole matter of library operations is sufficiently remote from the instructional enterprise," that such things as cooperative arrangements between libraries may actually "be matters of peripheral concern to seminary faculty, administrators, and trustees," and that the matter of library cooperation is not a highly charged policy issue. Miss Grossman questioned whether this concept foresaw any need for librarians in the theological schools of the 1970's. She asked whether librarians should learn such skills as computerization, the devices of automation and information retrieval, and the dynamics involved in programs of cooperation between libraries, if they are told "by our co-workers in the teaching fields and administration that the library is at best of marginal interest to them" She expressed fear that the theological training of the future minister would be entirely existential, anti-historical, and anti-intellectual, and he would become "a technician and practitioner rather than a thoughtful and sensitive human being."[112]

David Schulier, associate director of AATS, described the polarization of theological educators concerning the role of the library in educating men for ministry in an editorial in 1969. Some educators were "still struggling to make the library the center of the educational

---

[110]"Theological Curriculum for the 1970's," *Theological Education*, 4:700, Spring, 1968.

[111]"Theological Curriculum," p. 719.

[112]Maria Grossman, "Theological Libraries: Center or Periphery?" *Theological Education*, 5:125-127, Winter, 1969.

endeavor." Theological research was the watchword of this group; the achievement and maintenance of high academic standards, which they considered necessary for a learned ministry, was their goal. Another group increasingly questioned "the possibility of training men for ministry in a period of massive change primarily through lectures and library research."[113]

Glen W. Davidson, Coordinator of the Doctor of Ministry Program and Assistant Professor of Church History, the University of Chicago Divinity School, described this polarization a little differently. He indicated that one group said the library is necessary because "it is the core around which the seminary is built. Without the 'life of the mind' the life of the spirit becomes atrophied. Without books the 'life of the mind' can't exist." Another group indicated that the library was absolutely unnecessary because "libraries symbolize a decadent, abstract, and irrelevant past. What we have to learn for ministry today is found in the streets."[114]

Davidson stated that if theological libraries existed to support specialized research that was largely irrelevant to ministry in an age of cultural revolution, then its function must be changed. This change would include three aspects. The library, rather than a place of books at the core of the seminary, must become "part of a center from which both students and faculty can draw resource tools for analyzing the conditions and needs of contemporary society." The librarian must become "a research coordinator as much at home tapping the data of the present moment as he is the traces of the church fathers." Finally, the function of the library must be aligned with the purpose of the seminary.[115]

Davidson contended "the library must be part of an effort to integrate present experience with fundamental meaning." This was the point missed both by the group "who would keep the library a fixture of the enlightenment" and the group "who would abandon it for the streets."[116]

---

[113]Davis S. Schuller, editorial introduction, *Theological Education*, 6:5, Autumn, 1969.

[114]Glen W. Davidson, "The Library Versus the Streets?" *Theological Education*, 6:15, Autumn, 1969.

[115]Davidson, p. 20.

[116]Davidson, p. 20.

Actions of AATS

Three actions of AATS during this period should affect the theological library: the call for clusters of seminaries, the proposed standards, and the establishment of a committee on libraries.

The AATS in 1968 approved a recommendation calling for ecumenical clusters of seminaries in metropolitan areas near large state universities. Cooperative arrangements between seminary and university libraries would then be possible, to the mutual benefit of both.[117]

The first portion of the first report of the Committee to Revise Standards and Procedures in 1971 contained general standards for all schools and degree programs. The library is listed as one of the six divisions of this section (the others are: students, faculty, administration and governments, finances, and buildings), and more than half of this section is devoted to the library. Some of the significant highlights of this section follow.

The library program is to be a primary means for supplying the information services required to support the degree programs.[118] A broad spectrum of communications media, including ephemeral materials, is to be employed.[119] Service to the patrons over and above the normal library housekeeping functions is emphasized. Access to the facilities necessary for the operation of an adequate library program is stressed as a must, and "adequate portions" of the seminary's educational and general income should be devoted to the support of the library program.

---

[117]Klemt, p. 357.

[118]AATS, *Draft*, p. 2; the revised report calls for the services of the library to be "thoroughly integrated with the educational objectives," pp. 6,7.

[119]AATS, *Draft*, p. 2; in the revised report, this section has been completely rewritten to read, "In the changing society of which theological education is a part, the library should allow for flexibility and innovation. Hence an adequate library employs a broad spectrum of communications media. It is not exclusively concerned with printed media. Within the area of printed media, moreover, current developments in professional degree programs require increasing emphasis upon the supply of non book materials."

The program of the library should support and encourage both students and faculty to acquire the information skills and materials necessary for the continuing performance of their respective professions. The library program should include systematic instruction of students in the use of the library's resources, particularly the bibliographic tools essential to independent study and research.[120] The draft indicated that "members of the library staff have an obligation to know the current content of and methods employed in each corpus of instruction being offered by the seminary."[121] The revised report adds that "faculty have a reciprocal obligation to take initiative in the provision of such information."[122]

The first draft further indicated that the administrator of the library program should be a member of the voting faculty. This section was completely rewritten in the revised report:

> The administrator shall be an ex-officio member of any administrative group wherein long--and short-range planning for educational and financial policies are determined. At least the chief administrator of the library, as one who is involved in a major way in the total educational program, shall be a full, voting member of the faculty.[123]

One of the most significant statements is the following: "Sound management procedures shall be observed in the library program. These will include modern practices of budget preparation and control, budget forecasting, and program planning."[124]

The leadership of AATS evidently felt a need to give greater attention to the libraries and their needs than the standards revealed. The Executive Committee of the AATS approved the creation of a joint AATS-ATLA committee to study theological libraries in the light of current needs and trends. In its January, 1972 meeting, the ATLA Executive Committee appointed ATLA representatives for the committee. The title of

---

[120]AATS, *Draft*, p. 4; *Revised*, p. 8. [121]AATS, *Draft*, p. 4.

[122]AATS, *Revised*, p. 8.

[123]AATS, *Draft*, p. 4; *Revised*, p. 8.

[124]AATS, *Draft*, p. 4.

this committee, "AATS-ATLA Task Force on a Strategy for Seminary Libraries and Learning Material Centers for the 1970's," is very significant. Vigorous action by this committee could help achieve the integration of the theological library with the new trends in theological education.

SUMMARY

A number of congruent forces influenced the theological library role in the 1960's. The first was the Library Development Program which added $5,000,000 to the assets of one hundred theological libraries in five years. A force of equal significance, perhaps, was the imposed self-analysis by the schools involved. The mechanics of raising the library budget to match the Lilly grant money, and determining how and where to spend it by examining their collections and comparing them with a theological book list, had its impact on the theological community. A great deal of self-analysis would have been necessary just to absorb the added funds, but the availability of interested, sympathetic teams of theological educators to assist the schools during the five years of development added a new dimension. Outside, objective voices were added to those of the librarians who had sought greater support from their institutions. Inspired by the program, the theological community focused its attention on libraries. The theological library suddenly stood under a blazing spotlight of interest and concern. Librarians' salaries were increased and the library was regarded with new respect.

Paradoxically, these improvements were not paralleled by either the philosophy or method of theological education. Though the names were changed, the critiques of theological education indicated that a survey written forty-five years before would have sufficed. If these educators were correct, theological education still lacked a proper concept of its purpose, was isolated, parochial, and seemingly unaware of the chaotic change taking place all around. The teacher as knowledge-dispenser still stood at the center of the process, and the battle between continuing and terminal education continued. The myopia of previous generations was hereditary, because the educators who lamented the sad state of theological education seemed unaware of the potential of the library in alleviating

that condition. Although the libraries and their administration were improving steadily, their importance was minimal to theological educators in general.

Education in America experienced the greatest shake-up in its history. Students revolted against the depersonalizing experience of higher education as expressed in large classes and authoritarian teachers, as the Berkeley crisis in 1964 attested. Leaders in higher education began to see the students' side, and to ally with them in attempting to break the lock-step process of education. Reform in education became the order of the day.

Theological education, insulated from many of the forces that battered secular education, remained aloof and continued plodding its same old ruts. However, it began to be apparent that escape from change was only temporary. In their haste to adapt to the day, theological educators polarized concerning the library. Some felt the library to be secondary in importance and threatened to subordinate it even more than before. Others continued to assert its worth as of primary importance.

It became increasingly apparent that theological education could no longer continue its policy of isolation and still maintain its integrity and identity. AATS sponsored a series of studies that encouraged the clustering of seminaries and alignment with a university where possible. These studies only indirectly referred to or affected libraries. AATS also began the complete reworking of its standards for accrediting and appointed a committee to study theological libraries. Some elements of the proposed standards have profound positive implications for libraries. The latter part of the sixties and beginning of the seventies were times of extensive change in theological education. The draft of the committee to revise standards referred to the unprecedented amount of experimentation in teaching methods and procedures, and organizational arrangements in theological education. It remains to be seen whether these events signal a breakthrough to a new day in theological education.

CHAPTER VI

CURRENT INFLUENCES ON THE PHILOSOPHY, TEACHING METHOD, AND LIBRARIES OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Current educational theory has not been utilized in American theological education in any period, according to the theological educators cited in this study. A partial explanation is that subject expertise was more highly prized than teaching ability or training in educational theory for theological faculty members. Another reason may have been that theological education was regarded as so distinct and unique that the ordinary laws of education did not apply to it. The philosophy, method, and libraries of theological education were exempt from the commonly accepted educational theory and analysis of "secular" education by the "sacred" basis of their goals and curricula. However, today the distinction between the sacred and the secular is blurred. Coburn's assertion that theological education is good only when it is good education does not distinguish between sacred and secular (see p. 65).

In the past, theological education was concerned with the inner man and spiritual values; general education, with its concern for the outer man and materialistic values, had little to offer theological education. But theologians are returning to the Hebrew concept of the wholeness of man, and emphasizing the need to minister to the whole man. In turn, some theological educators are emphasizing the need to educate the whole man. General education is becoming more personal in its approach, centering its interest in the learner, and showing more interest in the spiritual. Theological education increasingly has more in common with, and should be more open to what it can gain from, general education.

The relevance, role, and authority of the church were once assumed to be clearly understood. Since the church was seldom questioned in spiritual matters, theological education was accepted as it was, regardless of its weaknesses. Both the church and the seminary were convinced their role was clearly defined, regardless of the relevance of that role

to the world. However, the relevance and worth of the institutional church are being increasingly questioned from without and within the church. The church has become confused concerning its role, and theological education shares this confusion.

Tom F. Driver, Associate Professor of Theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York, contends that "the purposes of theological education are no longer clear because neither society nor the church is able to define for a seminary what it ought to do." Theology seems to be rendered passé by the understandings of man and nature upon which contemporary society is based.

> The church, . . . without rudder or ballast . . . looks to the seminary for guidance, while the seminary looks back at the church, each wondering who will steer the ship that neither is convinced will be long afloat on the secular sea.[1]

The church seeks insights from society as to its role, purpose, and method. Likewise, theological education must look outward for some of the guidance it needs to chart its course.

Theological education has less basis for regarding its method and philosophy as unique than at any time in its history. Educators today increasingly appreciate the interrelation of every segment of education. Theological education must get its bearings within the context of general education, and, more particularly, higher education. Kerr contended that "there is no other alternative," since "concentrated attention in the past on theological education as a special category has produced so little for such a long time."[2] This chapter will trace some of the current forces in education that should influence the philosophy, method, and libraries of theological education.

INDIRECT INFLUENCES

The following paragraphs describe developments that directly affect higher education and indirectly affect theological schools and their

---

[1]Tom F. Driver, "Seminary Education: New Purpose-in-Being," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, 22:297, May, 1967.

[2]Kerr, "Education," p. 436.

libraries. The growing sensitivity to societal trends and willingness to learn from other levels of education on the part of theological educators should insure that their libraries will share the beneficial effects of these developments. These were listed by Earl J. McGrath, former U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Decelerating Growth in Student Enrollments

McGrath predicted that student enrollments will continue to grow, but that the rate of incrase will drop dramatically after 1975/76. Harried administrators will be free to divert their attention and energies from the complex problems created by rapid growth in enrollment to more educational issues. With a more stable student body to serve, the academic community will have both the time and the obligation to provide more effective learning through various experiments and reforms. The rapid proliferation of community colleges, with the wide diversity of interest and potential of their clientele, will accentuate this need for reform and experimentation.[3] Theological education should profit from this experimentation.

General Abandonment of Highly Selective Admission Standards

The concept of education for everyone, the demands of minority groups for higher education, and the discovery that students who were considered unqualified by traditional standards could achieve acceptable or even distinguished records, all are eroding the highly selective admission standards that have characterized institutions of higher education. The corollary to this development will be the necessity to provide individually paced learning. This need will have a tremendous impact on the educational system and the library.[4] Since theological schools traditionally have not been highly selective in their admission standards, this is not a new problem for theological education. The proposed AATS standards call for

---

[3]Earl J. McGrath, "The Learning Center in the Seventies," *What Are We Learning about Learning Centers?* ed., Marshall Gunselman (Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Christian College, 1971), pp. 7-11.

[4]McGrath, pp. 12-16.

compensatory admission policies for persons who have been deprived by racial or ethnic discrimination of the educational achievements assumed by the standards.[5] The individually paced learning demanded by this development is impossible without learning resources which the library is best equipped to administer.

Rededication of the Educational Profession to Teaching

McGrath saw a willingness, even an eagerness, on the part of the teaching profession "to modify the academic enterprise so as to make it more responsive to the contemporary needs of students and of society." He called this "an incipient renewal in the profession of a real dedication to teaching." One cause for this revival of interest is the problem of unemployment. Such opportunities as research for industry or government, consultation, etc., are increasingly unavailable for teachers.[6] There are currently thousands of unemployed teachers. The University of Illinois Appointments Bureau predicts that there will be 600,000 unemployed teachers by 1975.[7] Unemployment "may not be the best motivation for inspired teaching, but it may in the long run produce many effective members of the profession." In addition, the "infusion of new ideas from persons from other institutions and other occupations" will facilitate significant change in educational practices.[8] Their desire to do a better job should motivate teachers, including theological faculties, to look to libraries for assistance.

Growing Acceptance of Continuing Education as a Norm

McGrath spoke of

> . . . the now generally accepted concept that no amount of formal education, however effective, will prepare any one to be for long an efficient practitioner of his calling, an informed and

---

[5]AATS, *Revised*, p. 1.

[6]McGrath, pp. 16-17.

[7]Joel L. Burdin, "Chronology 1971: Events and Conditions of Most Significance to the Educational Community," *ERIC News*, 4:3, January, 1972.

[8]McGrath, p. 16.

> participating citizen, or a well adjusted and happy human being. Thoughtful observers of American society are committed to the view that continuing education throughout life is now as essential as eight years of schooling was considered adequate only fifty years ago.[9]

McGrath indicated there is a "growing agreement not only among educators, but among citizens at large as well, that learning and life must be coterminous."[10] This concept is compatible with the thesis of many theological educators that the seminary experience should be, in truth, a commencement, rather than a completion, of learning for the student. The library must play a prominent role in continuing education for ministry.

Decrease in Financial Support

McGrath predicted "a slowing down of the geometric increase in financial support of higher education from legislatures, corporate donors, and private philanthropists."[11] Private schools, including theological seminaries, have already felt the pinch of this trend, and will probably feel a greater impact in the future. For instance, the Tax Reform Act of 1969 continues to have an effect on foundations. These effects include

> . . . liquidation of hundreds of small foundations, increasing administrative costs . . payment of . . . taxes, increasing scrutiny of recipients of projects, and decline in the developments of new foundations or the disinclination to increase the endowments of those in existence.[12]

Thus the burden of greater efficiency is placed upon private institutions such as theological schools. There is already an increasing demand for educators to provide some evidence of what they do and how well they do it.[13] The effective utilization of learning resources can conserve

---

[9]McGrath, p. 7.

[10]McGrath, p. 18.

[11]McGrath, p. 7.

[12]Burdin, p. 3.

[13]Dennis D. Gooler, "Abstract of Some Thoughts on the Future and Instructional Technology," *Media Manpower*, 3:13, November, 1971. Gooler, of Syracuse University, presented the above to the Consultant Panel of the Leadership Training Institute of the Bureau of Libraries and Technology of the U.S. Office of Education.

valuable resources such as faculty time and talent.

INFLUENCES ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Some theological educators see a change of philosophy as the central need of theological education. A number of developments in education support this contention and can have a beneficial effect if theological education will accept them. Certain "myths" of education are being challenged. Viable alternatives to the traditional aims and assumptions of education are being proposed. The trend toward individualization of learning and facilitation of self-learning in education must be acknowledged. The geometric increase of nonbook media indicate a need for philosophical change while providing some solution to the dilemma they and other forces pose for theological education.

The Challenge of Educational "Myths"

A number of assumptions underlying educational theory that are being strongly challenged today are: the equation of education with schooling and teaching intent with learning, the designation of media as "audio-visual aids," and the assumption that there is a direct correlation between the traditional definition of aptitude and achievement.

The equation of education (learning) with schooling. A common assumption of the past was that education or learning was directly equated with schooling. An "educated" person was one who had been formally trained in a school setting. At one time the educated person was one who had a high-school diploma; soon the level had risen so a college degree was required for one to be regarded as educated. This assumption is being challenged on every hand. More and more classroom learning is regarded as insufficient; more credit is being given by schools for learning that has been achieved in nontraditional ways.[14] It can no longer be assumed that substantially all education is to take place in the classroom.

---

[14]Milton, p. 5.

People are, and always have been, educated by many forces other than the school. The growth and influence of mass media is increasing the influence of these outside educative agencies. Educational policy makers must take into account these forces that to a large extent shape the attitude and behavior of society. Whenever possible, these learning experiences need to be incorporated with the school experience to form a unified whole.[15]

The equation of teaching intent with learning. Teachers often mistakenly assume that their students are learning what they (the teachers) intend to teach. Westerhoff quoted Lawrence Cremin:

> The more I study the history of education, the more impressed I am with the distinct disjunction between what the educator thinks he is teaching and what his student learns or chooses to learn from the experience. The history of education is filled with instances of particular groups establishing goals, only to have those who come in contact with them use them for different ends.[16]

Greater reliance on supplementary learning resources could free the teacher from time-consuming lectures and allow him to ascertain whether his students are learning what he intended.

The designation of audio-visuals as "aids." Educators have long referred to media as "audio-visual aids." This terminology implies that films, filmstrips, or tapes are "aids" that are used to supplement the teaching experience. They are aids to the curriculum. There is a growing realization that this is a false concept--a myth. The following statement is representative of a growing philosophy concerning media:

> Media and curriculum constitute a tightly woven matrix, a spiderweb of inter-relationships. These new mediated learning experiences must be able to stand alone and be available to the

---

[15]John Westerhoff, "Freeing Ourselves from the Myth Makers," *Colloquy*, 4:7, July-August, 1971 (this article consists of an interview of Lawrence Arthur Cremin, the Director of the Division of Philosophy, Social Sciences and Education at Columbia Teachers College in New York.); William J. Quinly, "Carrells for Learning," *Library Trends*, 19:467, April, 1971.

[16]Westerhoff, p. 10.

> learner in a variety of environments, in a variety of formats, to meet a variety of needs. This will become the curriculum.[17]

One might paraphrase McLuhan, "the media is the curriculum." Media should soon become a normal part of the learning experience.

The Emergence of Viable Alternatives to the Traditional Educational Approach

Carl R. Rogers, a leading psychologist and educator who was affiliated with the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, is representative of a growing group of educators who are calling for optional alternatives to the present educational process. Rogers sees the possibility of two types of learning, two possible aims for education, and two possible sets of assumptions in education.

Two types of learning. One type of learning, associated with the traditional approach to education, is cognitive or associative "body of knowledge" learning, such as the memorization of letters and numbers of the multiplication tables. This type of learning is often painfully difficult and quickly forgotten. Another type of learning is experiential or learning through discovery--learning what is wanted and needed by the individual. An illustration of this is the adolescent who avidly devours everything he can find about gasoline engines in order to improve the efficiency of his hot rod. Rogers listed five elements of experiential learning: it has a quality of personal involvement, is self-initiated, pervasive, evaluated by the learner, and its essence is meaning.[18]

Two possible aims for education. Rogers indicated that one possible aim for education is to transmit knowledge--to inculcate into essentially passive conformists stored knowledge that has already been accumulated. The second possible aim is to nurture the process of discovery. Dr. Rogers contended that the second aim should be adopted because of the terrific

---

[17] *Summary Report,* Sixteenth Lake Okoboji Education Media Leadership Conference (Iowa City, Iowa: The University of Iowa, 1970), p. 33.

[18] Carl R. Rogers, "The Facilitation of Significant Learning," *Instruction: Some Contemporary Viewpoints,* ed. Lawrence Siegel (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967), pp. 37-38.

pace of change in our society. Knowledge stored up in the past is not enough. Answers to problems of the past are inadequate and must be replaced by trust in the process by which new problems are met. This implies a new goal for education: learning how to learn, with involvement in the process of change.[19]

Two sets of assumptions in education. One set of six assumptions is implicit rather than explicit in teaching today: (1) the student cannot be trusted to pursue his own learning; (2) presentation equals learning; (3) the aim of education is to accumulate, brick upon brick, factual knowledge; (4) the truth is known; (5) constructive and creative citizens develop from passive learners; and (6) evaluation is education and education is evaluation.[20]

Rogers contended that our culture cannot afford to permit its citizens to develop under today's educational system. He proposes a new set of assumptions to replace the present ones: (1) human beings have a natural potentiality for learning; (2) significant learning takes place when the subject matter is perceived by the student as having relevance for his own purposes; (3) such significant learning is acquired through doing; (4) learning is facilitated when the student participates responsibly in the learning process; (5) self-initiated learning, involving the whole person of the learner--feelings as well as intellect--is the most pervasive and lasting; (6) creative learning is best facilitated when self-criticism and self-evaluation are primary, and evaluation by others is of secondary importance; and (7) the most socially useful learning in the modern world is the learning of the process of learning, a continuing openness to experience, and incorporation into one's self of the process of change. Experiential learning is facilitated when the learner is confronting a problem that is meaningful to him and for which he desires a solution.[21]

Experiential learning would require utilization of a wider range of resources than the traditional approach. An educational system that

---

[19]Rogers, pp. 39-40.

[20]Rogers, pp. 40-41.

[21]Rogers, pp. 40-54.

would facilitate this type of learning must assign a place of central importance to its library.

The Trend Toward Individualization of Learning

John E. Tirrell, President of Oakland Community College, contrast the educational options open to the student with his freedom to choose outside the classroom. He referred to what is called "the black coffee syndrome." The student can go to the cafeteria and, using nothing but machines, choose from one to twenty-four options of combinations. He can choose coffee, with or without a number of additives, tea with the same choice, hot chocolate, soup, and so forth. When he leaves the cafeteria to go to the classroom, however, he is given only black coffee. His ability, background, taste, and experience are disregarded.[22] Tirrell called for more individualization of the learning process, a growing trend today.

Importance of individual differences. The abilities of students vary, and there probably are as many ways of learning as there are individuals engaged in a learning activity. According to David M. Crossman, Assistant Director of Libraries at the University of Pittsburgh, the running battle for many years between the cognitive theorists and the behaviorist school in education has left little area of agreement between these two schools. The education profession is left "with very little theory that can generally be inferred about the learning process."[23] Crossman contended that it is this very disagreement that "has stimulated perhaps the most important trend in American education of the past decade."[24] He also described this trend:

> We have finally come to the conclusion that it might be wise to concentrate on the many differences among learners rather than

---

[22]John E. Tirrell, "Goodbye to the Classroom," *Library College Journal*, 1:31, Fall, 1968.

[23]David M. Crossman, "The Remote Access Audio/Video Information Systems," *Library Trends*, 19:438, April, 1971.

[24]Crossman, p. 438.

> center all of our attention upon their far fewer similarities. As a result of this rather dramatic departure from conventional ways of looking at learning patterns and related instructional needs, the idea of individualizing learning has gathered strength.[25]

Use of nonbook media. The diminishing funds for education obviates hiring adequate personnel to achieve individualization, necessitating a teacher substitute or aid. This is a role that media can fill. Extensive media resources in a school can provide for greater flexibility in the teaching program by providing for independent, individualized learning. The utilization of tapes, cassettes, films, filmstrips, and microfilm can help match the form and speed of the learning experience to the individual student.[26] The repertoire of teaching aids ranges from television to programmed learning. Television provides for mass instruction and programmed learning provides the ultimate in individualized instruction. Lying between these two "extremes" are other aids, such as motion pictures, filmstrips, language laboratories, and materials for independent study.[27]

Facilitation of self-learning. There is a growing consensus that self-learning, which is closely allied to individualized learning, should be a goal of all education. The contention is that the teacher is not an "information-dispenser," but one who motivates, encourages, and assists students in making the best possible use of the available learning resources. Jay, speaking of what he calls "the new seminary," stated:

> There is a growing acceptance of the principle that covering the field is less important than making the crucial connections between the tradition and current issues, that an important part of the teacher's task is to develop self-learners, persons who

---

[25] Crossman, p. 438.

[26] John B. Haney and Eldon J. Ullmer, *Educational Media and the Teacher* (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1970) p. 8. Haney is associated with the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, and Ullmer with Florida State University.

[27] Alvin C. Eurich, "Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century," *Atlantic*, 211:53, June 1963. Eurich is a distinguished educator and president of the Academy for Educational Development. He formerly was with the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education.

> will be continuously engaged in the educational process, to develop rational processes and patterns for action which will grow in depth with the growth in years.[28]

This contention is echoed by a number of other scholars.[29]

The passivity of theological students may inhibit the development of self-learning in theological education. Despite the militancy of some, the typical seminary student tends to be passive, receptive, dependent, and conformist in his outlook.[30] However, students may soon be calling for more individualization, independence, and self-direction in their study. If the theological student of tomorrow has been exposed to self-learning in his pre-seminary experience, he will expect this approach in his theological learning experience. The development of self-learners necessitates greater utilization of library learning resources than traditional methods.

The Proliferation and Growing Importance of Nonbook Media

A revolutionary influence on education today is the growing availability, efficiency, and economy of nonbook media. Theoretically at least television has "made the standard lecturer obsolete and the conventional laboratory demonstration inadequate and costly." Lectures by the world's greatest scholars are increasingly more available for commercial consumption, although these are largely limited to audio formats at the present time. Basic subject content can be recorded in nonbook media form, relieving teachers of time spent lecturing and freeing them to work with students on a one-to-one basis with fresher minds and more time. The students can have the opportunity for a firmer grasp of the subject matter, since they can study at their own rate of comprehension and review the material as often as needed.[31]

---

[28]C. Douglas Jay, "Change, Relevance, and Theological Librarianship," *Theological Education,* 61:12, Autumn, 1969.

[29]Robert Gaylor, "The Philosophy of the Last Frontier," *Library-College Journal,* 2:35-40; McGrath, p. 20; Malcolm Boyd, p. 229.

[30]Hugh T. Kerr, "Seminarians and Self-directed Study," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin,* March, 1971, p. 72; Shaull, p. 84.

[31]Eurich, p. 53.

Nonbook media suit the sensory-orientation of today's student and give him greater freedom in the learning experience. They can be used to fill in the "gaps" in his understanding of the world, the church, and the Christian mission. Media can provide a more experiential type or learning. With the availability of such learning resources as the cassette player and software that is compatible with the home television set, continuing education can become a reality in theological education. The learner can be "plugged in" where he is. The acceleration and individualization of learning can be facilitated. With the variety of learning resources available, the teacher is no longer bound to the lecture and textbook, but can adapt his teaching to his students and subject.

Roles of nonbook media. The intent of the instructional use of media is to achieve specific learning that can be identified and on which the learner can be tested. A dramatization, such as a film or video tape, can provide a literary production, a reenactment of a historical event, or a simulation of human behavior. A documentary can provide an accurate recording of an event as it occurs, such as a mission or theological conference. The performance analysis function of media is utilized in theological education today, such as the video taping of practice sermons in homiletics classes. Nonbook media can be used to simulate planning or decision making situations, or the dynamics of a counseling experience. Nonbook media can serve as a source of student involvement, motivation, and expression as students prepare their own materials for use in the classroom.[32]

Since learning resources are not limited to the printed word, the criteria for library materials should be the extent to which they contribute to the curriculum of the school and the learning experience of the students. The values of the contributions of nonbook media to education have been repeatedly and dramatically demonstrated in recent years. They can be used to release faculty members from routine and repetitive functions, such as the repetition of basic lecture material. They can help insure that all students receive the same information and have equal

---

[32]Haney, pp. 12-14.

opportunities for learning. The improvement of teaching methods can be facilitated as teachers view material they have audio or video taped. Students can be allowed to proceed at their own pace and at their own chosen time. Independent study can be facilitated. The attention span and willingness of students to learn can be increased.[33]

Advantages of nonbook media. Nonbook media have a number of advantages over more traditional methods. They evoke more than they define, suggest rather than explain, and "go beyond illustrations and move on to discover a deeper meaning in things." Media help develop an emotional response to reality by making students think and by involving them emotionally in the learning situation. Babin used the illustration that when Jesus began gathering his disciples about him, he did not invite them to attend his lectures, but to "Come and see." Jesus invited them to learn by participation. Babin contended that media encourage creativity, for a group of students making a presentation through the use of media will be more creative than a group using some type of oral communication. He said that media

> . . . will definitely break through traditional catechetical formulas. They will require a new kind of faith that is more comfortable with creativity and research than with ready-made syntheses, because they immerse us in the world of the senses. Sensory experience and the awakening of basic instincts are always at the source of new movements and great periods of creativity.[34]

Media also encourage personal involvement and help develop critical awareness.[35]

Risks of nonbook media. Babin confessed that because of the creativity and subjectivity involved in the creation of media, there are

---

[33] *Guidelines for Audio-Visual Services in Academic Libraries,* (Chicago: ALA, 1968), pp. iii-iv.

[34] Pierre Babin, *The Audio-Visual Man* (Dayton: Pflaum, 1970), pp. 8-9, 35, 39. Babin is a French educational psychologist and Catholic priest.

[35] Babin, pp. 40-41.

risks involved in their use. One of these is a lack of clarity and precision. Some people today complain that people are losing their ability to think. Babin stated that "a certain kind of thinking is losing ground: *thinking that stresses precise ideas, exact wording, and rigorous logic.*" This contrasts paradoxically with the extreme precision demanded in modern computer language. The very fact that media are intended to stimulate the listener/viewer to supply some of his own answers accounts for some of this lack of clarity and precision.[36]

The second risk in the use of media, according to Babin, is the lack of structure and synthesis involved. The student in the past was more "lineal" and related to his world in terms "of a highly structured worldview and logical correlations," using logic and the discursive syllogisms. The media student of today "relates to the world through his skills in communication and his experience of meaning, rather than through a set of principles and categories." Thus, the lack of structure and synthesis and the mode of the media will appeal to the media-oriented student while the lineal student may be dismayed and discouraged.[37]

INFLUENCES ON THEOLOGICAL TEACHING METHOD

A number of influences should vitally affect the teaching method of theological education if faculties are open to change. Educators are prescribing a new role for the teacher: manager of learning resources. A new student generation and new understandings of learning and learners demand new teaching methods. New definitions of learning aptitude, if proved, will necessitate a restructuring of the teaching-learning approach.

Research on Dispensing Learning Content

Robert Dubin and Thomas C. Taveggia of the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration of the University of Oregon pooled the data from ninety-one studies of the relationship between achievement and teaching methods between 1924 and 1965. Instead of adding together or summarizing the conclusions of these studies, the data from

---

[36]Babin, pp. 41-42.

[37]Babin, p. 42.

them were added together to obtain an overall view. This was done to avoid the effect of perpetuating unwarranted and unsupported claims which may have been made in the original investigations. These ninety-one studies included over eighteen courses and subject-matter areas. Comparisons were made of the following teaching methods: lecture, discussion, combinations of lecture and discussion, supervised and unsupervised independent study, television, and both book and machine programmed materials.

On the basis of their reanalysis of the data of these ninety-one studies, Dubin and Taveggia concluded:

> These data demonstrate clearly and unequivocally that there is no measureable difference among truly distinctive methods of college instruction when evaluated by student performance on final examinations.[38]

The authors indicated that perhaps the factors these teaching methods have in common are as important or more important than their differences. They suggest that perhaps the outstanding commonality among teaching methods is the textbook or textbooks utilized. They state "perhaps the 'no difference' results of comparing teaching methods can be attributed largely to the powerful impact of textbooks which cannot be washed out by any known methods of instruction!"[39]

Ohmer Milton, director of the Learning Research Center of the University of Tennessee, indicates that the conclusion of the above study is consistent with several other investigations. One of these employed three methods--lecture-discussion, small groups without the instructor, and independent study--with reduction of time in class from 30 to 80 percent. Milton reported that:

> Not only were there no substantive differences in achievement, but on a specially constructed learning resourcefulness test, there was no consistent pattern of results in favor of any of the procedures.[40]

---

[38] Robert Dubin and Thomas C. Taveggia, *The Teaching--Learning Paradox* (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968), p. 35.

[39] Dubin, p. 47.

[40] Milton, p. 3.

Milton submitted that research until recent years had dealt with "single surface conditions" such as "class size, frequency of class meetings, and manner of presentation," to the "exclusion of other factors and forces." These variables "have no major impact on learning as measured by *content* tests." The influence of these variables has been quite small even when they have been combined in investigations. Milton indicated that these studies have been based on "an assumption of considerably dubious validity:" that there is "one best method of instruction for all students in all subject matter areas." He stated that they may also have been based on Thorndike's conception that the process of learning is essentially the same whether the student is learning a simple motor task or a difficult abstraction.[41]

A dominant theme of educational literature is the ubiquity of the lecture method and the extreme distaste some individuals have for it. The Dubin and Taveggia research neither favored nor condemned the lecture method. However, Milton asserted that such research suggests that there can be a dramatic decrease in dispensing content in the prized ways, such as the lecture method and the classroom, without any decrease in quality of learning.[42]

Research Affecting the Teacher

A number of developments in education should dramatically influence the role of theological teachers. Scholars picture the teacher as a manager of learning rather than a dispenser of knowledge and skills. Recent research indicates that there are no significant differences in teaching methods when measured in traditional ways. The lecture-prone teacher can take no relief, however, for research also indicates that other methods of dispensing learning content are as effective, and less expensive, than the live lecture. A variety of learning resources can make the learning experience more effective and enjoyable, while affording the teacher some relief.

The changing role of the teacher. Evidence indicates that the teacher of the future will not function as an isolated agent presenting

---

[41] Milton, p. 3.

[42] Milton, p. 6.

material to students and then testing them occasionally. In fact, Arnold Come, President of San Francisco Theological Seminary, contended that teachers will not be needed in the seminary of the future "for any of the mechanical and factual part of the learning program." He stated that "a new breed of biblicists, historians, theologians, and liturgists will emerge who will serve as the learning catalysts in the 'fields' and the synthesizers at the center."[43] Harold E. Mitzel of Pennsylvania State University indicated that in the future the terms for teacher may be "instructional agent" or "lesson designer" or "instructional programmer."[44] The teacher may, in fact, be a manager of, or catalyst for, learning; one who serves as a member of a learning resources team composed of specialists in education.[45]

Haney defined a scholar as "one who is growing ignorant at a less rapid rate than others" in this day of rapid change. No longer can the teacher be the authority on all facts, but he must "become a guide and counselor to the pupil, a manager of the learning situation."[46]

Other methods as effective as the live lecture. Following is the abstract of a paper reporting an experiment at Iowa State University:

> The students in an introductory college psychology course were given the option of attending live lectures (control group) or listening to audio-taped lectures (experimental group). Each experimental group was issued a tape recorder, a set of lecture tapes, and a schedule of lecture topics as presented to the control group. Conducted in the Fall quarter and repeated in the Spring, the experiment confirmed by means of an objective final examination that taped lectures can be as effective as traditional lecture presentation in supplying information to college undergraduates.[47]

---

[43]Arnold B. Come, "Discussion: the Seminary in Ten Years," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review,* 22:343, May, 1967.

[44]Harold Mitzel, "The Impending Instructional Revolution," *Research in Education,* June, 1970, pp. 1-2.

[45]Milton, p. 5. [46]Haney, p. 6.

[47]John W. Menne, *et al.*, "The Feasibility of Using Taped Lectures to Replace Class Attendance," a paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, 1969 (Educational Resources Information Center, U.S. Office of Education, 1969), abstract. The authors are associated with the Student Counseling Service of the Department of Psychology, Iowa State University.

The aim of this experiment was to seek ways of alleviating the pressure on instructors and classroom facilities. The Fall experiment involved 149 students in the experimental group and 211 in the control group, whereas the Spring experiment involved 141 in the experimental group and 197 in the control group. Because of the inequality of the size of the two groups and the possibility of difference in the two experimental groups, several dependent variables were analyzed by "covariance analysis using a regression technique." The high school rank, American College Testing Composite scores, and the Minnesota Scholastic Aptitude scores were used in the evaluation of the two groups. The cumulative grade point average was available and utilized in the Spring experiment. There were no significant differences between the two groups, according to these dependent variables. There was no significant difference between the mean course grade attained by the two groups in the experiment.

The students in the lowest quartile experimental group according to their high school rankings achieved significantly higher total scores. The scores for the other high school ranking quartiles were insignificantly different or reversed from Fall to Spring quarters. The report states that "from this we may infer that the taped lecture may have benefitted the students in the lower performance quartile more than the traditional lecture." There was a notable difference in the number (five) of those in the experimental group who dropped the course compared to the number (fifty-eight) in the control group who dropped the course. The researchers felt that this was possibly because students tend to drop a course if they have fallen behind in their work and see little hope of recovering, which does not occur as readily if the material is always available on tape. They concluded that lower-level, largely content-oriented courses could be handled very successfully in this way.[48]

Need to utilize multimedia in teaching. Some authorities assert that teachers of today still have the option of choosing the learning resources they will use, but that option may no longer be available in the near future. Teachers will have to use a variety of learning resources

---

[48]Menne, pp. 2-5.

to provide the volume of information and quality of understanding needed. The following quote is representative of what some educational scholars are saying today:

> The greatest possible variety of learning resources should be used to enrich the learning process for each student . . . the various forms of media are an integral part of 20th century life and cannot be considered a mere adjunct or aid to education. They must be understood as a major force in the learning process.[49]

The New Type of Student

The student is demanding, and being assigned, a central place in education. Students everywhere, including theological students, are rejecting the traditional teacher-centered approach to education. Kerr contended that no longer can teachers "isolate themselves within their own academic enclaves, proclaiming the virtues of their disciplines, and deploring the intellectual sloth of students who do not do it their way." He indicated that "students will simply not tolerate this kind of academic snobbishness."[50] Kerr stated:

> We have come to the end of a long and energetic era of education in which teaching and content have dominated the whole process. The next stage will completely rearrange every campus in the country, and in the resulting dislocation, and possible confusion, at least one clear perspective will emerge: *a new educational concern for the student and the learning situation.* This will mean taking seriously the student-as-person.[51]

This new concern for the student heightens the importance of the difference between today's and past student generations. There are some definite ways in which today's student differs from the student of

---

[49]Ross L. Neagley, N. Dean Evans, and Clarence A. Lynn, Jr., *The School Administrator and Learning Resources* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969), p. 10. Neagley is a professor in the Department of Educational Administration of the College of Education, Temple University; Evans is President of Burlington County College, Pemberton, New Jersey; Lynn is Director of Learning Resources, Burlington County College. See also Fred John Pula, *Application and Operation of Audiovisual Equipment in Education* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968), pp. v-vi.

[50]Kerr, "Seminarians," p. 76. [51]Kerr, "Education," p. 448.

previous generations. The way he perceives and learns, his relationship to his world, what he seeks in life, his own awareness of himself, his relationship to the "establishment" and to education, all set him apart from previous student generations. These characteristics must be taken seriously by theological teachers.

Uncertain commitment. In the past, the enrollment of a student in seminary indicated a commitment to the church and a vocational decision. A certain breadth and depth of theological understanding could be assumed. Today, almost the exact opposite is true. In many cases, the student is grappling with his own understanding of and commitment to the church, and his vocational commitment, if he has one, is to "ministry" in terms of "a life of service to man, focusing on the alienated and sick." Uncertainty characterizes his theological assumptions. Jay indicated that these students are:

> . . . unsettled, seeking foundations, unsure of their understanding and commitment to God, suspicious of dogmatic teachers, anxious for more personal attention, support, and guidance than they have yet experienced, demanding more freedom to pursue that which they find to be most vital.[52]

He felt that the implication here is that the resources for contemporary and future theological education must be broader in scope than in the past. These resources can be provided primarily through university libraries, with which theological schools should develop working relationships.[53]

New conceptions of ministry, theology, and education. Richard L. Schaper, a first year student at the University of Chicago Divinity School, contended that the "new student" demands a "fundamental change in theological education--change in concept of ministry, in understanding of theology, and in vision of education." The new student sees ministry as *function* rather than *status*. "Ministry is not restricted to present forms

---

[52]Jay, p. 10.

[53]Jay, pp. 8-9; see also Driver, p. 304; Richard L. Schaper, "The Challenge of the New Student," *Christianity and Crisis*, 29:91, April 14, 1969.

or instances of institutionalization." Theology is seen as something that is done, rather than learned. The student is increasingly suspicious of educational attempts to indoctrinate him with the answers to the questions of past generations. He insists on beginning with the present. He refuses to fully accept the content-transmission, teacher-as-authority mode of education. He insists on being a participant in the formation of his theological beliefs. Theological education that is parochial and closed upon itself is unacceptable. Theological education must have an "on-the-job training" context. It must relate to the contemporary world. Schaper stated:

> The "new student" seeks a theological education that does not attempt to "program" him with what to say to the world, but one that will help him learn how to listen to the world and how to make theological sense out of it.[54]

Sensory, audio-visual. Pierre Babin, a French educational psychologist and Catholic priest, contended that the Christian educator today faces not only a completely new and rapidly changing universe, but "a new kind of man, with a new way of communicating, of living and understanding, a new mental framework, a new kind of activity and involvement." The real issue in Christian communication and education is this "new kind of man who communicates in a new way." Babin said that man is undergoing a fundamental change due to the influence of media, and that "it is no longer possible to communicate with him unless we are taking this change seriously."[55] Kerr maintained that "students are increasingly restive under a system that uses cognitive, rational, intellectual, cerebral criteria as the only measures for ability, quality, excellence, and maturity."[56]

Babin asked:

> What is happening to a boy who reads 18,000 pages of comics a year, who is consistently listening to radio, records, looking at television, or going to movies? What new ways of learning, of understanding, and of being, has the multi-sensory experience of audio-visual language created? How must we change in order to reach students who have been attuned to the latest TV commercials since they were four years old?[57]

---

[54]Schaper, pp. 91-92.

[55]Babin, pp. 40-41.

[56]Kerr, "Education," p. 439.

[57]Babin, p. 11.

The typical child will have spent more hours watching television by the age of five than he will spend in college classrooms. Babin stated that "the development of mass media through electronics has extended man's body and given him a new awareness of his senses." Following the theory of McLuhan that media are extensions of a human faculty, either psychic or physical, and that these media have awakened his senses in a new way, he said, "modern man has acquired new dimensions. The extensions of his body makes it difficult for him to adjust to experiences that are not all-inclusive sensory experiences."[58] This includes learning experiences.

Alienated. Many people today feel that they have little control over the institutions affecting their lives or even over their destinies. Some people have always felt this way; what is new today is the proportion of people who now experience widespread feelings of alienation.[59] This is true of a growing number of theological students.

Quality-seeking. According to Gooler, the fact that America is a land of quantity has affected education. In the past when 50 percent of school age youth dropped out, educators were concerned about the quantity of education. Today, when 80 percent of our young people graduate from high school, the emphasis is changing to a concern for the *quality* of life, and the *quality* of education.[60] Kerr asserted that his students have taught him in recent years that:

> . . . the life of the mind is not enough. They keep talking about developing a new quality of life, and they even think of theology itself as a lifestyle. I think in this approach they sense something of profound importance for theological education and the church.[61]

Subjective. Shaull contended that "the collapse of authority patterns and values, the impact of the new electronic media, the accelerated pace of social change," among other things, have contributed to a "new self-awareness" on the part of theological students. This results in

---

[58]Babin, pp. 14-15.

[59]Gooler, p. 13.

[60]Gooler, p. 13.

[61]Kerr, "Seminarians," p. 76.

> . . . a new type of subjectivity, which may now be agonizing in a profound identity crisis, but which also is capable of participating in a constant process of self-discovery, exploration of new dimensions of life and experience and the creative shaping and changing of the world.[62]

Opposed to the traditional process of education. Many of the new generation, according to Shaull, feel repressed, dominated, and manipulated by the current structures of society, including education. Conformity is the price they must pay for the rewards offered to them by society and by education.[63] Kerr stated that many educators and students, "though not many in theology," are convinced "that *the whole educational enterprise represents an oppressive self-serving social system.*" Very little allowance is given in the educational process for critical reaction. Even though theological students, for the most part, do not appear to have this impression of the educational system, there are indications that this issue will be important to them in the future.[64]

The traditional approach of theological education, with its teacher-centered, lecture-dominated classroom, further alienates this new student. He is not prepared for dogma delivered monologically and tied to the past, nor for a passive role in the learning process. His sensory appetite is unsatisfied, his search for identity thwarted, and the whole system too similar to an "establishment" he distrusts. The learning resources he uses must be rich in variety and sensory experience. Few, if any, teachers can satisfy his learning needs without aid from outside the classroom. Media, supplied from a media center or library, are increasingly essential.

Learner Characteristics

Today's learner is characterized by new patterns of learning, an overdeveloped sensory appetite, and a new type of intelligence.

New patterns of learning. Babin indicated that "audiovisual man learns by in-depth involvement," in the same way that a "blind man learns

---

[62] Shaull, p. 83.

[63] Shaull, p. 83.

[64] Kerr, "Education," pp. 443-444.

by touching." It is difficult for him to understand by abstract representation; he must understand primarily by direct contact. Intellectual explanations are superfluous because he is "attuned to the connections between images, sensations, and sounds." He understands "through the effects that flashing neon signs, lavish displays, musical ads, radio and television have upon him." Babin said:

> It has been said of audio-visual man that he thinks with sounds and images, but there is more to it than that. This man sees with a camera, writes with a typewriter, hears through tape-recordings. In other words, the technical extensions must be included in any definition or appraisal of modern man's way of learning, understanding or doing. In order to learn, modern man needs the amplification and the sensory selection available to him through technology.[65]

Overdeveloped sensory appetite. Students of learning today are realizing that a lasting impression is one that results from the use of more than one sense organ. Fred John Pula, of Boston University, indicated that the student's ability to perceive governs his ability to understand the happenings around him. He said "our perceptions depend on our ability to use all senses in acquiring both an understanding of our surroundings and an understanding of the interplay between our sense organs."[66]

Babin referred to the "extra-ordinary sensory development" of modern man. His thinking, buying, working, communicating, praying are associated with sensory stimuli. Modern man creates a multimedia environment wherever he goes: "In large department stores we are confronted with music, light, pictures, colors, decorative gadgets, escalators, and warmth." Young people are especially addicted to this multimedia environment: "records, guitars, dancing, lights, bright colors, and irridescent posters" dominate the atmosphere wherever they meet. Educators, however, have been slow to recognize the value of this fact in learning.[67]

The value of the use of sensory stimuli in learning is illustrated by the following report:

---

[65]Babin, pp. 22-23.

[66]Pula, p. 18.

[67]Babin, p. 24.

> The psychology of learning demonstrates that the senses of sight and hearing account for 94 percent of all learning. Furthermore, an in-depth study by the Mobil Oil Company of all income groups of both white and blue collar workers showed that after three days only 10% of the material taught by simple telling could be recalled, 20% of the material was recalled which had been only shown, while 65% of the material taught by both telling and showing was recalled.[68]

New type of intelligence. Babin indicated that "this new civilization tends to eliminate the literary, intellectual, reflective abstract and conceptual type" of person. The modern student is bombarded almost constantly with sensory stimuli from a variety of sources. He does not understand these by reason and reflection, but by organizing these stimuli in a meaningful pattern for him. Understanding to him can be defined in terms of his ability to make a maximum number of connections of these stimuli in a meaningful pattern. This is clarified by the following illustration.

> What does understanding mean for a man who reads *Life*, *Time*, or the local newspaper, while taking the train home at night? He is not trying to penetrate, to go deeply and thoroughly into what he is reading. He merely wants to know the general trend of international and local events, to "be in the know," to participate.[69]

Babin compares the mind of audio-visual man to "an IBM computer: its function is to translate, sort, compare, organize, read, give the answer in a minimum of time."[70]

Research on Accelerating Learning

Influenced by the report of the Carnegie Commission on higher education in January, 1971, educators are realizing that the education process can be accelerated without loss of efficiency. The theory is that a college education could be reduced roughly by one-fourth without sacrificing educational quality.[71] Experimental programs are being launched to test the validity of this theory.

---

[68]Emery Tang, "Understanding the Listener as Movie-goer," *Preaching*, 2:28, September-October, 1967.

[69]Babin, p. 28.

[70]Babin, p. 29.

[71]McGrath, p. 20; Milton, p. 3.

Some experiments have demonstrated that the individual student can comprehend at a much faster rate than the average lecturer can talk. If this is true, then lectures reduced to tape form and speeded up would not only individualize that lecture experience, but conserve the student's and the teacher's time and efforts.

New Definitions of Aptitude

McGrath indicated that much classroom teaching in the colleges and universities "results in only a modest amount of meaningful, functional, and lasting learning." The level of learning efficiency of some students is far below their apparent potential even under teachers well versed in their subject matter and dedicated to their job. On the other hand, some students "acquire an impressive body of knowledge, master complicated intellectual skills and most important of all develop such an interest in the things of the mind that they continue to learn long after" they have left the classroom, even when taught by teachers with unimpressive formal qualifications using unconventional procedures. Recent research reveals that:

> Many students learn below their abilities, or fail entirely, in courses in which if the conditions of learning were based on what is already known about differential human capacities and effective learning situations, they would have no difficulty in rising to superior levels of achievements.[72]

Educational theory has commonly linked aptitude with achievement. Since the use of aptitude tests for predictive purposes showed a high correlation between such tests and achievement, the theory was that "high levels of achievement are possible only for the most able students." In its simplest form, the theory is "that the students with high levels of aptitude can learn the complex ideas of the subject while the students with low levels of aptitude can learn only the simplest ideas of the subject."[73]

---

[72]McGrath, pp. 3-4.

[73]Benjamin S. Bloom, "Learning for Mastery," *Evaluation Comment*, 1:3, May, 1968. Bloom was Professor of Education at the University of Chicago.

Aptitude has been redefined by some scholars in recent years as *"the amount of time required by the learner to attain mastery of a learning task."* The assumption of this definition is that all students could attain mastery of a learning task if they were given enough time. This leads to the conclusion that if the means can be developed for helping each student, learning mastery is theoretically available to all. Some scholars are contending that "the grade of A as an index of mastery of a subject can, under appropriate conditions, be achieved by up to 95 percent of the students in a class." If every student had a good tutor, then most of them could master a particular subject to a very high degree.[74]

INFLUENCES ON LIBRARIES

The theological library likely will undergo a tremendous change, though it will probably lag behind its college and university counterparts. William J. Quinly, Director of the Media Center at Florida State University, stated that library service "should undergo the most spectacular transformation it has experienced since the invention of the printing press" within the next decade. Many libraries are already undergoing transition from book-oriented to computerized facilities. The local or institutional library as we now know it may no longer exist by the end of the century, for it may have become part of a vast information network. Libraries are evolving from repositories of printed materials into learning resource centers that offer both book and nonbook materials.[75]

A Role Change

Libraries must change to avoid a reduction in their effectiveness. No force will compel a library to include media and the latest electronic advances. No force will compel libraries to provide higher levels of reference service and to stimulate the fullest use of their resources by their patrons. Libraries are not likely to be forced to become part of

---

[74]Bloom, pp. 3-4.

[75]William J. Quinly, "The Selection, Processing and Storage of Non-Print Materials: Aids, Indexes and Guidelines," *Library Trends*, 16: 274-275, October, 1967.

information networks to provide wide and rapid service to their patrons. However, it is very likely that they will be supplemented by another agency that will fulfill these functions, if libraries refuse to step into the vacuum created by developments in education.[76]

Increased Usage and Importance

Library circulation records are sure to be rewritten in the near future, not only in terms of the nature of the material circulated, but in volume as well. The changes in education now underway indicate that a greater variety and volume of learning resources must be made available, and that the educational process itself will insure greatly increased usage of these resources. Indicating one aspect of this educational change and its impact on library use, Jay says:

> As professors are freed from the idea that they must cover all the ground in basic courses and are freed to lecture on aspects of the subject where they can make their best contribution, and as students are set free to do much more on their own under faculty guidance, demands upon the library will inevitably increase.[77]

Part of a Network or System

No library can provide all the learning resources necessary for its patrons. Some educators conceive the library function in terms of process rather than traditional library buildings, personnel, and materials. There is pressure upon theological libraries to maximize their resources, by either clustering or combining their assets and resources. Working relationships are being established with university and college libraries wherever possible. Library networks based on regional, state, national, subject, and perhaps other parameters are being established to cope with the information explosion and patron needs.

A Center for Educational Resources

The term "learning resources center" is replacing "library" as

---

[76]Richard Lunham, "Marian the Technologist?" *SDC Magazine*, 11:9, November, 1968.

[77]Jay, p. 12.

the title of the place where the learning materials are stored and retrieved. The replacement of rote learning by inquiry and discovery in the educational process, the demand for the greatest possible variety of learning resources to enrich the educational process, and the fact that nonbook media have become an integral part of twentieth century life and are no longer considered a mere adjunct or aid to education all indicate a drastic change in the library's role. Although some schools are establishing media centers apart from their libraries, many others are expecting their library "to assume the role of a learning center with programmed material and electronic access to data banks of multi-media resources."[78]

An Active, Aggressive Partner in Education

Ronald C. Diener, Librarian at Boston Theological Institute, Cambridge, contended that a library can be either an asset or a liability in theological education. He said:

> A library can be an asset in theological education if the librarian has a clear vision of the supporting role he plays in research and in the formation of the theologian. A library can be a liability if it serves only its own purposes and if its sole active role is as a purchaser in the book trade. A library can be an asset when the clientele challenge bibliographic skills and technical services. A library can be a liability when the theologians, divinity students, and pastors prefer to have low expectations of what the library can offer rather than meet the demands of their own responsibilities with a library's resources. But a *library* without an aggressive program is an indefensible luxury in a time of austerity budgets.[79]

The library should be a full partner to the teaching faculty. It should be an active participant, rather than a passive repository. If the learning resources needed for today's education are provided by the library, effective education is possible. If these resources are winsomely and efficiently promoted and administered, effective education is probable.

---

[78]Quinly, "Carrells," p. 467; see also Neagley, p. 10, and Elizabeth Paschal, "Organizing for Better Instruction," *Campus 1980,* ed., Alvin C. Eurich (New York: Delacorte Press, 1968), p. 224.

[79]Ronald E. Diener, "Pooling of Resources and Bibliographic Control," *Theological Education,* 61:52, Autumn, 1969.

Library-Seminary?

The most radical concept of the library today is fostered by the Library-College movement, which hails Louis Shores, Dean Emeritus of the library school of Florida State University, as its patron saint. The movement conceives of the library as the college and college as the library. The mode of learning is independent study, primarily by "reading" the "generic book." The library is a learning resources center, a repository for the "generic book." The term "generic book" was coined by Louis Shores, and includes all types of learning and teaching media, including print and nonprint, book and nonbook. The faculty of the Library-College must possess bibliographical expertise to facilitate the independent study of the students. The curriculum is conceived as very broad, interdisciplinary, and flexible. The library is central in both importance and location, and is equipped to handle all media. Carrell seating is provided for most of the student body at all times in the library. The library not only collects material to support the curriculum but actively initiates changes in the curriculum. The enrollment of the Library-College would be limited to 500 students.[80] It is estimated that some three hundred colleges and universities in the United States are carrying out experiments of the Library-College type.[81] It is not likely there will ever be many library-seminaries, but this movement has valuable insights for theological education.

INFLUENCES ON LIBRARIANS

A key person in the change that is necessary if higher education is to meet the needs of our day is the librarian. Since most institutions cannot afford a separate media center, and since the librarian is trained in information storage and retrieval, he is the logical person to assist in the provision, maintenance, and utilization of the learning resources needed in our day.

---

[80]Fay M. Blake, "The Library-College Movement," *Drexel Library Quarterly*, 3 and 4:175-178, July and October, 1971. Blake is Associate in Academic and Research Libraries, State Department of Education, Albany, New York.

[81]Louis Shores and Janiece Fusaro, "Innovations," *Learning Today*, 5:61, Winter, 1972.

A Prevalent View of the Librarian

Though written almost a decade ago, Lyle's assessment of the current concept of the library and librarian is probably still true. He indicated that the notion among administrators and faculty was that librarianship is a technique and librarians are technicians. Librarians assist in keeping the institution going but play no part in directing its course. They are not classified as clerical persons, but rank little above these.[82]

The New Role of the Librarian

In contraposition to this popular concept, or more accurately, "misconception," this paper conceives the most important factor in the success of the library program to be the librarian. No quantity of books, no vast array of electronic gear, no beautiful building can substitute for an enthusiastic, knowledgeable, and capable librarian.

Librarians should shake their image as technicians or "keepers of books" and assume the role of information resource specialists. They must be versed in learning theory and instructional programming. Though some see librarians as becoming teachers, the breadth of their responsibility will be so great that any teaching beyond that of library use and research techniques will be obviated. If librarians do not adjust to the need of the hour, they may well be replaced by a whole new breed of information specialists.[83]

Counselor to teachers and students. The wide range of needs and interests on the part of today's theological student indicates that the librarian should be a resource person. He should not only understand these needs and interest and provide for them in the library, he should be

---

[82]Guy R. Lyle, *The President, the Professor, and the College Library* (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1963), p. 22. Lyle, Director of Libraries at Emory University, is a leading authority on library administration.

[83]Quinly, "Carrels," p. 467; Lunham, p. 2.

available to assist the students in time of need. This counseling role of the librarian has rarely been exploited. In the educational process, the librarian is in a position not only to counsel students concerning the resource materials they need, but to counsel teachers on the study habits and abilities of their students, as well as the resources available to support their courses.[84]

Manager and producer of educational resources. As the chief administrator of the library, the librarian will have the responsibility of managing the educational resources, including printed and nonprinted materials. A new dimension is being added to the role of the librarian in many learning resources centers: that of the producer of resources. Libraries have long accepted the responsibility for the storage and retrieval of a variety of resources. Learning materials prepared by the teaching faculty are often deposited in the library for storage and retrieval. It is but one step further for the librarian to assume the responsibility for assisting the teaching faculty in the production of many of these learning resources. If the library already has the responsibility for the administration, maintenance, and distribution of nonbook media equipment and materials, then it is the department with the greatest expertise in the utilization of nonbook media. Many learning resource centers today contain materials production centers, from which a faculty member may request a teaching aid or have his idea or outline transformed into an overhead transparency, filmstrip, film, video tape, or some other form of teaching medium.

An educator. The librarian should be more than an information specialist, counselor, or manager of educational resources. He should be all these, but he should be preeminently an educator. He should be as concerned that students learn as anyone else on the campus. He should not be satisfied with rising circulation statistics, growing book budgets, and faculty status. He should do more than facilitate the storage and retrieval of information. He should be as concerned with the curriculum committee as the library committee. He should be a perennial student of

---

[84] Jay, p. 11-12; Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson, pp. 129-130.

education and learning theory. All that he is and does should be subservient to the central figure in the educational process--the student. He should strive to provide the ideal combination of environment, learning resources, and personnel to insure not only learning, but self-learning, and the development of attitudes and skills that will provide the motivation and ability for life-long learning. In addition, he must look beyond his campus and have a similar concern for ministers needing continuing education to cope with the challenge of ministry in today's world.

SUMMARY

A possible solution to the dilemma posed by the decrease of funds, the change in student clientele, and the demand for options to the traditional approach and more experiential learning, is a renovation of theological education. Current developments signal the need for change. More consideration should be given today's student, for he is not likely to be fitted into the pattern of the traditional teacher-dominated, content-centered approach. The new student is sensory-oriented by a world dominated by mass media; he will resist the dry lecture and dogmatic answers prescribed by the teacher. Shaped by a system adapted to his needs, he is likely to be repulsed by the approach of the typical theological school.

Some of the foundation stones of traditional education are being eroded by the results of contemporary educational research. The typical classroom with a professor lecturing and testing the students is no longer mandatory. The teacher can be freed from the impossible task of dispensing knowledge in a day of exponential growth of knowledge and rapid change by a variety of alternatives to the lecture method. He can be freed to contribute his knowledge of and love for his subject to students and to facilitate learning by adapting various educational devices to the needs and abilities of students.

The teacher needs an ally, however, for he is not equipped to prepare the learning resources needed for his new role or to locate prepared materials. Already overworked, the average seminary professor may be overwhelmed by the new trends. The ally could be a media center, in which both personnel and equipment are provided to implement the new

role. However, some libraries and librarians are seeing this as a function for which they should volunteer. By providing all the learning resources for the educational process in the "generic book," the library can help make the new role of the teacher a reality.

Through the individualization of the learning process and the utilization of media, students can find the educational system adapted to their needs. The type of learning and teaching described is already a reality in some education centers. Theological education has changed very little in its history. There is a possibility that the combination of the above developments will accomplish what has not been achieved in past history--the syntonizing of the philosophy, teaching method, and libraries of theological education to produce a truly effective educational process.

CHAPTER VII

THE LIBRARY ROLE IN 1971: A SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATORS AND LIBRARIANS OF AATS

The role of the library is indicated by a study of history and the current forces that directly or indirectly influence it. The library should be a center of learning resources, sensitive and responsive to the needs of its educational environment. Conversely, the library should exert an influence on its environment. Proper planning and provision could make possible a philosophy of theological education that would otherwise be wishful thinking. The provision of proper resources and a healthy relationship to the teaching faculty could facilitate a revolution in teaching methods that would otherwise be impossible.

The present historical study bears out that the library has advanced farther than the philosophy and teaching method of theological education. The question remains: "How far toward the ideal pictured above has the library progressed? To what extent is this ideal a reality?" A corollary question concerns the readiness and ability of the library and the rest of the institution to make this ideal a reality.

A questionnaire was prepared to gather statistical data to portray the present role of the library in theological education and project its potential for changing ideal into reality. The data desired were: (1) the conception of the library's function in theological education held by the president, deans, and librarians of AATS schools, (2) the extent to which the libraries of these schools are involved in administering media, (3) the role of the faculty library committees, and (4) the relationship of the librarian to persons or groups within the institution who could enhance his educational function.

The questionnaire was sent to the librarians, presidents, and deans of 168 AATS members. One-hundred-seventy-one replies were received from 98 administrators and 73 librarians of 122 schools. The administrators represented 85 institutions and the librarians 73. There was no reply

from 46 schools. The answers from the administrative officials were grouped together for the purpose of this study. Answers on the types of libraries, which are charted below, were received only from the librarians.

Table 1

Types of Libraries

Independent private	47	64.4%
University related	15	20.5%
Member of a cluster	11	15.1%
Affiliated with a cooperative group	11	15.1%
Other	10	13.7%

A cross section of types of institution in theological education and those responsible for the interpretation of the function of the library in theological education was secured. The data compiled from the questionnaire were organized to reflect the philosophy and practice of these institutions and administrators.

THE FUNCTION OF THE LIBRARY IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Each respondent was given the option of checking any combination of four possible functions and/or listing a completely different function in answer to the question, "What, in your opinion, should be the function of the library in theological education?" They were then asked to state their philosophy of the library's function in theological education. The responses are charted on the following page. Where a respondent listed a separate function, it was included with the statements of philosophy regarding the function of the library.

Table 2

The Function of the Library in Theological Education

	Administrative (98)		Librarians (73)	
	%	No.	%	No.
A passive repository of books	1.0%	1	1.4%	1
An aggressive, integral part of the education process	68.4%	67	72.6%	53
A full partner in education for ministry	83.7%	82	71.2%	52
A center for learning resources including both book and nonbook media	79.6%	78	57.5%	42
Other	2.0%	2	2.7%	2

According to Administrative Personnel

The description most popular with the administrative personnel was "a full partner in education for ministry" (84 percent chose this definition). Almost as many (79.6 percent) chose the learning resource center concept, and 68.4 percent saw the library as an aggressive, integral part of the education process. Only one administrator chose the concept of the library as a passive repository of books. The majority of these administrators regard the library as (1) a center for learning resources and (2) a full partner in the educational process for ministry.

Answers to the request for a statement of philosophy of the function of the library were given by 79 administrative personnel. The following quotes are indicative of the importance many of these administrators attribute to the library:

As important in the development of theological education as an excellent faculty

The library is not simply useful, but essential to our task

It is basic to theological education along with faculty

The library is the heart of all that we try to do in theological education

Indispensible and of primary importance

Central facility

Central and indispensible

Second only to the faculty in importance

A basic support element in the total educational process

An exceedingly important part

The heart and center of the academic program

Plays a central, indispensible part

The student's contact with the library should be the single most effective part of his educational experience

The throbbing heart of the seminary

Of central significance in the life of a theological seminary

Next to faculty members and fellow students the library is the most important resource

The chief research resource

An absolute necessity

One of three foci of theological education (the other two being the classroom and the setting for field education) and the only one which could exist without the other two

One of the three major resources available to students (faculty and experience are the other two)

A number of aspects of the library function were listed as shown below:

Aspect	*Times Listed*
Provide resources for study	39
Full and equal participant (partner) and contributor to the educational process	6
Research, reference assistance	6

Instructional enterprise, along with the faculty.....6
Support objectives and curriculum.....6
Develop research skills.....6
Stimulant to teachers and students.....5
Environment for learning.....4
Lifeline to minds of creative thinkers of all ages.....2
Assist the integration of the heritage of the past and contemporary thought into Christian faith and life.....2
Same as institution.....2
Dialogue.....2
Point of contact.....1
Information storage and retrieval.....1
Only resource (no textbooks).....1
Inform faculty and students.....1
Curriculum dependent upon.....1
Resource service.....1
Service institution.....1
Teach with books.....1
Servant.....1

The most comprehensive answer was:

> The library should be a resource service for both students and faculty. It should also assist faculty members in producing aids both for classroom use and as supplementary learning experiences for students. It should also provide materials for individual study programs. Its service should be storage, retrieval, consultative, productive, and supportive.

According to Librarians

Most librarians (72.6 percent) chose the function of the library as an aggressive, integral part of the educational process as the most important of the four options. The concept of the library as a full partner in education for ministry was next in popularity (71.2 percent). Less than 60 percent of the librarians conceived of the library as a center for learning resources, including both book and nonbook media. Only one chose the passive repository of books concept.

There were fifty-nine answers to the request for a statement of philosophy of the library function. The librarians did not describe the importance of the library function as forcefully as the administrative personnel. The strongest statements were as follows:

The heart and center of the college

The 'hub' of the seminary education process

The center or hub of the educational process

A basic tool of the faculty

A vital and integral part of the primary instructional program

One librarian stated, "We provide resources for courses taught. Period."

Another stated of the librarian, "He is not too aggressive and I doubt the desirability of making him a catch-all for tapes, films, etc."

The aspects of the function of the library listed were:

Aspect	*Times Listed*
Provide resources	34
Organize resources	13
Actively promote use of resources	12
Integral element and partner to the total educational process	6
Means of training student to educate himself	3
Place where learning process is continued and expanded from the classroom	3
Support curriculum	3
Center of service	3
Stimulate learning and research	2
Provide services	2
Resource center	2
Comfortable center	2
Administrate media	1
Teaching instrument	1
Support faculty	1
Bring books and readers together	1
Assist seminary in its task	1

Teach with books.....1
Center for study and research, and a catalyst.....1
Information storage and retrieval.....1
Contribute to educational objectives.....1
Learning center.....1
Assist in continuing education.....1
Inviting, comfortable, easy to use.....1

Out of seventy-nine replies, the administrative personnel mentioned nonbook media specifically only three times, while the librarian mentioned nonbook media seven times in fifty-nine replies. Both groups used terminology that could very well have been inclusive of nonbook media, but they were not specified as such.

In Relation to Nonbook Media

The chart below indicates present organizational relationship of media to these libraries:

Table 3

The Relation of Media to the Library

Audio-visual center apart from the library	16	(23.5%)
Complete media services department within the library on a par with readers services and technical services	9	(13.2%)
Media integrated in the library collection and administered by the library staff	33	(48.5%)
Other	10	(14.7%)

The chart indicates that 61.7 percent of the libraries are responsible for media, either in a complete media services department

within the library or integrated in the library collection and administered by the staff.

The following chart indicates the answers to the other questions relating to library responsibility for media. Only one of these questions related to the librarian was included in the questionnaire sent to administrative personnel.

Table 4

Responsibility for Nonbook Media

Questions	Administrative Officials			Librarians		
	Yes	No	Partial	Yes	No	Partial
* Does this include your audio-visual materials & equipment?	58 (60.4%)	27 (28.1%)	11 (11.5%)	33 (50.8%)	18 (27.7%)	14 (21.5%)
Do you have a budgeted amount for media?				20 (35.7%)	36 (64.3%)	
Is it part of the library budget?				34 (70.8%)	14 (29.2%)	
Do you have special or extensive collections of nonbook media?				15 (26.8%)	38 (67.9%)	3 (5.4%)
Is your instructional staff encouraged to use media in their teaching?				31 (60.1%)	13 (25.5%)	7 (13.7%)
Do you have workers with special training who administer the media and equipment?				17 (32.1%)	36 (67.9%)	

* Refers to administrative responsibility of the librarian.

Curiously, although Table 3 indicates that 61.7 percent of the libraries are responsible for media, only 60.4 percent (see Table 4) of the administrative personnel and 50 percent of the librarians indicated that the librarian's responsibility included audio-visual materials and equipment. This may be at least partially explained by the fact that Table 3 is a tabulation of answers from librarians only, that there were more answers to the question tabulated in Table 4, and that those librarians who indicated a separate media services department within the library do not regard this as a direct administrative responsibility (22 percent indicated a partial responsibility).

Only 35.7 percent of the librarians indicated that they had a budgeted amount for media, although 70.8 percent indicated provision within their library budget for media, and 26.8 percent indicated the ownership of a special or extensive collection of nonbook media, that the instructional staff of their school was encouraged to use media in teaching was indicated by 60.1 percent, and 32.1 percent indicated they have workers with special training to administer the media and equipment. The clientele to whom the nonbook media are available is shown in the following table.

Table 5

Persons to Whom Nonbook Media Are Available

Faculty	52	(71.2%)
Staff	50	(68.5%)
Students	52	(71.2%)
Interlibrary loans	22	(30.1%)
Other	15	(20.5%)

The following methods are used to encourage the use of nonbook media:

Reminders, memos.....9
Workshops, demonstrations.....8

Personal promotion.....6
None.....5
Listed in acquisitions list.....3
Left to faculty discretion.....2
Media resource person.....1
By dean.....1
Varies.....1
Coordination of use.....1
Maintenance.....1
Media Center (instructional).....1

In January, 1971 Ronald W. Jones, under a research fellowship in the utilization of electronic media in theological education at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri, surveyed by questionnaire the 112 accredited members of the AATS. Eighty-two of 112 schools responded to the questionnaire. Over 90 percent of the respondents were using the audio reel to reel tape recorder; 60 percent used the audio cassette tape recorder; and 78 percent used the video tape recorder in the educational process. Over 56 percent of the schools used some combination of audio and video recorders. Curricular utilization included major usage in the broad areas of speech and communication (homiletics), worship and music, education and counseling. Less usage was reported in the areas of media (broadcasting, relationship to fine arts, etc.) and audio-visual communications and techniques. Some usage of media in the exegetical, historical and systematic areas of theology was also indicated.[1]

THE FUNCTION OF THE LIBRARIAN IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Each respondent was presented the choice of two functions of the librarian: a manager of educational resources or an educator whose specific function is to manage learning resources. Space was left for them to specify a totally different fuctional description, if they wished. These responses are charted on the following page.

---

[1]Ronald W. Jones, "Utilization of the Electronic Media: Audio and Video Tape Recorders," (unpublished report, Concordia Seminary, 1971), pp. 19-20. Used by permission.

Table 6

The Function of the Librarian in Theological Education

	Administrative Personnel		Librarians	
	%	No.	%	No.
A manager of educational resources	22.4%	22	28.8%	21
An educator whose specific function is to manage learning resources	75.5%	74	68.5%	50
Other	4.0%	4	9.6%	7

They were also asked to state their philosophy of the librarian's function in theological education. Responses to "other" were included with the statements of philosophy.

<u>According to Administrative Personnel</u>

A large majority (75.5 percent) of the administrative personnel viewed the librarian as an educator whose specific function is to manage learning resources, 22.4 percent pictured him as a manager of educational resources, and 4 percent listed other distinctive descriptive functions. Only two of the respondents marked more than one of the categories.

There were seventy-seven statements of philosophy of the function of the librarian by administrative personnel. These include very graphic statements concerning the importance of the librarian:

A most important member of the staff

The one giving the biggest assist to any professor

The single most important person in the learning process

The person responsible for making possible the theological and educational process

Another says:

> The librarian is an integral part of the educational process, a man whose breadth of theological knowledge and familiarity with a variety of resources can be crucial to a seminary or college.

The aspects of the function of the librarian are charted below, in order of frequency mentioned.

Aspect	*Times Listed*
Acquisitions (develop resources, weed, etc.)	27
Educator	15
Knowledge of theology and theological education	12
Facilitate efficient functioning of library	11
Faculty member	10
Director of library	8
Administrator	8
Consultant to faculty and students	8
Trained librarian	7
Keep library central in thinking of academic personnel as integral part of theological education	7
Research resource person	5
Motivate faculty and students to use library resources	5
Curriculum planning and educational policy	4
Oversee all learning resources	4
Develop faculty interests	3
Inspire educational process	3
Anticipate professors' needs	2
Skilled in utilizing educational resources	2
Keep current	2
Suggest innovative resources and uses	2
Academic council member	1
Equal to faculty in educational process	1
Love books	1
Bibliographical expertise	1
Work closely with president	1
Guide, philosopher, friend	1
Keep balance in collection	1

The most comprehensive statement was that the librarian should:

1. Be committed to theological education.
2. Know and understand the objectives of the school.
3. Know and understand the needs of students and faculty.
4. Be aware of curriculum content.
5. Know aids and resource materials and counsel regarding these.
6. Secure, maintain, and circulate aids and materials supporting curriculum.
7. Participate in curriculum development.

According to Librarians

A majority (68.5 percent) of the librarians saw their function as an educator whose specific function is to manage learning resources, 28.8 percent as a manager of educational resources, and 9.6 percent stated another descriptive function. Five of the librarians marked more than one of these options.

There were fifty-eight statements of philosophy returned. The only graphic statement of the importance of the librarian's function was that he is in a "strategic position on the seminary team."

Aspects of the function of the librarian are charted below:

Aspects	*Times Listed*
Acquisitions of balanced collection of resources for educational program (book selection)	22
Manager of educational resources	16
Educator	15
Reference, resource in research	12
Facilitate efficient functioning of library	8
Promote resources	6
Library research teacher	5
Assist faculty to keep up-to-date	4
Teaching with books	4
Knowledge of theological education	3
Bibliographical expertise	3
Catalyst	3

Caretaker (efficient).....2
Help develop educational policies, curriculum.....2
Understand institution's objectives.....2
Faculty member.....2
Efficient manager of finances, resources, and information.....1
Alert to new teaching methods and resources.....1
Not merely a custodian of books.....1
Knowledge of curriculum needs.....1
Resource person.....1
Understand educational theory.....1

As Indicated in Institutional Relationships

Six questions pertained to the relationship of the librarian to the faculty, administrative council, and curriculum committee, whether the institution has a job description for the librarian, and whether or not the counsel of the librarian is sought in the planning of new programs and courses, as shown on the following page.

Table 7

Responses to Yes-No Questions

Questions	Administrative Officials			Librarians		
	Yes	No	Partial	Yes	No	Partial
Does the institution have a job description for the librarian?	29 (35%)	55 (65%)		20 (30%)	48 (70%)	
Does the librarian hold faculty status?	90 (92%)	6 (6%)	2 (2%)	63 (89%)	6 (9%)	2 (3%)
Does the librarian function as part of the administrative council of the school?	35 (42%)	45 (54%)	3 (4%)	29 (42%)	36 (52%)	4 (6%)
Is the librarian a member of the curriculum committee?	25 (27%)	67 (73%)		18 (29%)	42 (68%)	2 (3%)
Is his counsel sought in the planning of new programs and courses?	62 (67%)	16 (17%)	15 (16%)	35 (49%)	18 (25%)	18 (25%)
Does he have full administrative responsibility for the library?	93 (99%)		1 (1%)	69 (99%)		1 (1%)

The librarian has full administrative responsibility for the library according to 99 percent of the administrative personnel with the library committee exercising some responsibility in the other 1 percent. Budget and book buying are the exceptions listed by the 3 percent of the librarians who indicate less than full responsibility, with the other 97 percent indicating full responsibility.

Full faculty status for the librarian is indicated by 92 percent of the administrative personnel, 6 percent do not hold faculty status, and 2 percent indicate partial status. The librarians reported that 88.7 percent hold faculty status, 8.5 percent do not, and 2.8 percent indicate partial status.

There were seventy-eight answers from administrative personnel to why the librarian holds faculty status, with five "no" answers. In three of the latter cases, faculty status will be granted upon the earning of either a doctorate or a library school degree. One librarian does not have faculty status because he does not want it, and another because he is not a teacher.

The reasons listed for faculty status are charted below:

Reasons	*Times Listed*
Need for librarian participation in faculty decisions and discussions (including curriculum)	15
Librarian teaches	12
Librarian considered a theological educator, a partner in the learning (teaching) process	11
Librarian in every sense a part of the faculty	9
For reciprocal communication of information	7
Librarian a key person in academic program, the educational, learning process	6
Importance of librarian's position	5
Teaches bibliographical courses	4
Tradition	3
Librarian position an academic one, central to teaching	3
Librarian qualified academically	3
Former member of teaching faculty	2
Psychological, to facilitate his communication with other faculty members	1

Necessary to an effective educational program.....1
Yes, but I don't think it necessary.....1

Forty-seven librarians stated they have faculty status, and five indicated they do not. One of the latter group indicated that faculty status would be conferred when he completed his professional library degree. Another indicated that for accreditation purposes it was necessary that he be listed as full-time librarian rather than faculty member to insure a clear librarian function. Another indicated that faculty status was to be conferred. One librarian did not hold faculty status because he was not an ordained minister and did not have a Ph.D. degree. In another school the librarian does not hold faculty status because no policy has been established.

The reasons for faculty status are charted below:

Reasons	*Times Listed*
Position integral to educational process, partner in education for ministry	20
Teaches (one: "If not, reevaluation of status")	7
Same responsibility and role as other faculty	4
Information purposes	2
Communication facilitating	2
Qualified academically	2
Faculty before librarian (chronologically)	1
Pressure from AATS	1
Librarian asked for it	1
Equivalent rank, but not tenure, because an administrator	1
Necessary for accreditation	1

The librarian regularly functions as part of the administrative council of the school according to 42 percent of the administrative personnel, while 54 percent indicate that he does not, and 4 percent indicate sometimes.

The chart on the following page indicates the lines of authority within the institution with respect to the librarian. As noted, 61.2 percent of the administrative personnel indicated that the librarian is responsible to the president, 45.9 percent indicated the dean, and 10.2 percent indicated responsibility to some other person or group. The

librarians indicated 46.6 percent of them report to the president, 47.9 percent indicated responsibility to the dean and 12.3 percent indicated responsibility to some other person or group. In some cases, a dual responsibility to some other person or group, as well as the president or dean, was indicated.

Table 8

Lines of Authority

	Administrative Personnel		Librarians	
	%	No.	%	No.
President	61.2%	60	46.6%	34
Dean	45.9%	45	47.9%	35
Other	10.2%	10	12.3%	9
Blank	4.1%	4	4.1%	3

Twenty-seven percent of the administrative personnel and 29 percent of the librarians indicated that the librarian is a member of the faculty curriculum committee, whereas 72.8 percent of the administrative personnel and 68 percent of the librarians indicate that he is not. Three percent of the librarians indicated that they had been a part of the curriculum committee in the past. Sixty-six point seven percent of the administrative personnel and 49.3 percent of the librarians indicate that the counsel of the librarian is sought in the planning of new programs and courses, 17.2 percent of the administrative personnel and 25.4 percent of the librarians indicate it is not, while 16.1 percent of the administrative personnel and 25.4 percent of the librarians indicate varying degrees of consultation.

One administrative official (an academic dean) discussed the relationship of the librarian to the academic council and the curriculum committee. After indicating there may be a deeper principle involved, he states:

> Is the librarian an educator and part of the academic program--or is he more in the area of the school's general administration? I think the question raised here would need considerable thought. The thing primarily at stake is not the status of the librarian but the relationship of the library. This may be a very difficult distinction for a librarian to make--his own status and power in the operation of the school as opposed to the commitment and educational purpose of the library itself.

He indicated that the librarian should be a part of the curriculum committee if he is an educator, but not if he is part of the overall school administration.

As Reflected by the Professional Background and Training of Librarians

As recently as 1961, Charles L. Taylor described the evolution of the seminary librarian's professional role as follows:

> At first seminaries had no, or very few, full-time librarians. A professor was in charge, giving part of his time to the library and using such student or clerical help as he could command. In a second stage, as libraries grew, many schools hired a man or woman, generally the latter, who had received training in library science, and who was more or less supported by a library committee of the faculty or by a professor still called technically librarian. But for a few seminaries at least, this was not enough, and a third stage of progress brought in as librarian a full-time person, generally a man, fully trained both in theology and in the techniques of library science.[2]

One question sought information from the libraries concerning the process by which they chose their profession. Their answers contrasted sharply with the above description.

The question was answered by sixty-nine librarians. Thirteen of these indicated that they had chosen their profession after working in the library as a student. Forty-two indicated either that they had chosen

---

[2]Charles L. Taylor, "Panel on Professional Library Personnel," *Summary of Proceedings*, Fifteenth Annual Conference, ATLA, 1961, p. 93.

librarianship as a first profession or voluntarily entered the field from another profession. Ten indicated that they were asked to leave another profession, such as the pastoral ministry, to become a librarian. Four of the answers were difficult to categorize. Thirty-two of the sixty-nine mentioned having received graduate library science degrees. The majority of the others either are known to have a graduate degree in library science, or can be assumed to have. The majority of these theological librarians have either chosen librarianship over another profession or after experience in library work have gained professional training.

THE FUNCTION OF THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Since the faculty library committee plays an important role in the effective functioning of the library and librarian, one question requested a statement of the committee's function.

According to Administrative Personnel

Ninety-four of the administrative personnel responded. The descriptive terminology they used to describe the library committee's function are listed below:

Terminology	*Times Listed*
Consultant body	43
Administrative (supervision, policy making, etc.)	35
Book selection, acquisitions	26
Facilitate library use and function	15
Liaison between librarian, administration, and faculty	13
Relate library and faculty in educational process	5
Assure balanced collection	5
Budget	4
Assist librarian	3
Interpret needs to library	2
Provide forum for discussion	1

According to Librarians

Seventy-one librarians responded. The descriptive terms they used are listed below:

Terminology	*Times Listed*
Advisory	51
Assist in establishing overall, major policies	26
Support librarian's policies	12
Acquisitions	12
Interpret library needs to faculty and students	10
Liaison	10
Discern needs library can meet	8
Interpret library needs to administration	5
Budget preparation	4
Oversee library (set policy, administrative)	4
Non administrative (keep out of the way)	4
Communications medium, point of contact	3
Enlist faculty cooperation	1
Should be none; librarian should rank as department head	1
Balanced collection	1

SUMMARY

The results of the survey analyzed in this chapter give pertinent indications of the current state of the library and its potential. There is always a risk that the philosophy of the library's role stated by these educators does not accord with their practice. However, a person's philosophy is unlikely to fall below his practice.

On the basis of the questionnaire, the theological librarian is a professionally trained individual with full responsibility for administering the library. He has faculty status, but generally does not function as part of the administrative council. He is a member of the curriculum committee in 70 percent of the cases, and is consulted concerning new programs and courses in more than half of the schools. His faculty status is based on his educational role. He is responsible to the head of the institution in approximately half the schools.

The administrators of theological schools have a more advanced conception of both the library's and the librarian's role than their librarians. The survey indicates they are more willing for the library to become a resources center and the librarian to become an educator than are the librarians. The results of the questionnaire indicate that perhaps the lack of syntonic relationship among the philosophy, teaching method, and library in theological education, may be attributed as much to the library as the other two. It definitely indicates that theological librarians need to reevaluate their concept of the library's role if theological education is to adequately respond to the challenge of the day.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The philosophy, method, and libraries of theological education should be syntonically related; that is, each dynamic should be so attuned to the other two that a change in one would automatically result in change in the others. If the philosophy changes, the classroom and libraries should adjust correspondingly. A change in teaching method should result in a reevaluation of the philosophy and a modification in learning resources to facilitate the new method. The one instance in which a negative influence of one dynamic on the others is unavoidable relates to libraries. If library learning resources are inadequate, method must center in the resources available--teacher and textbook--regardless of the philosophy. However, the reverse is not true, for elaborate library provision can be made without discernible change in teaching method or philosophy.

This study indicates that there has not been such a syntonic relationship. There has been little basic change in philosophy or method, while libraries have steadily improved. One could not affirm, however, that change has been completely absent from the theological education scene, nor that there has been a lack of interest in effective education. There has been an average of at least one survey of theological education in every decade since 1924. These have been seriously received and attempts have been made to correct the weaknesses they revealed. However, the changes in theological education have not been proportionate to the recommendations of the surveys, owing in part to the lack of insight by theological educators that the library could play a major role in the reform of theological education. A few educators have had this insight, but they have been misunderstood or ignored.

Application of current educational theory has been lacking in theological education. Perhaps this is due to the conviction on the part of many theological educators that Christianity consists of a body of truths to be preserved, defended, and propagated. According to the

literature of theological education, these educators felt that the task of theological education was to convey this body of truth to the theological student and equip him to preserve, defend, and propagate it. This view has been renounced again and again and a discovery approach advocated, but the role of the library has been neglected in the call for change.

The teaching methods of theological education have mirrored the educational philosophy indicated in the survey. There is an amazing unanimity of theological educators that theological education has historically been lecture-dominated, content-centered, and textbook-oriented. The teacher has been the authoritarian figure in the process, dispensing knowledge and skill in piecemeal fashion. Naturally, the role of the library has been a negligible one.

Paradoxically, theological libraries have grown steadily in every respect (though they are still inferior), while the philosophy and method of theological education have remained basically the same according to the critiques and studies analyzed. This neglect of theological libraries is astonishing, since an obvious solution to the weaknesses cited would seem to be the utilization of library resources. Some real problems in theological eduation were articulated very well by theological educators, but most of them failed to see the library's role in their solution.

The basic conclusion of this study is that there has not been a syntonic relationship among the philosophy, method, and libraries of theological education. There are two obvious reasons for this: (1) most of the theological educators who saw and cited the ills of theological education failed to propose a role for the library in their cure; and (2) theological libraries failed to exert an influence on the other two dynamics in proportion to their growth. The solution proposed by this dissertation is that the theological library deliberately attempt to positively influence the other two dynamics.

This study revealed that the theological faculty member needs to be a trained educator, as well as a subject specialist. It is perhaps more imperative that the librarian become an educator. Perhaps the library should seek to become an active part of the educational process;

stereotyped roles should be discarded, and any distaste for electronic media overcome. The library should be committed to storage and retrieval of learning resources, regardless of form, and to a supportive role in the learning process, regardless of professional goals. The theological teacher should be provided with options to the lecture method. The library/learning resources center should be a function of the institution, not just a "place." The teacher and the librarian should be colleagues in the teaching-learning process. The teacher should be as at home in the library as he is in the classroom or office, and the librarian at home in the classroom. Through the proper adaptation and administration of learning resources, students should learn more in less time and with more enjoyment. As the dull and repetitious are eliminated, learning will be more colorful and exciting. Perhaps if the library will take the first step, a true reciprocity of influence can be established that will result in a syntony among the philosophy, method, and libraries in theological education.

APPENDIX

Sample Questionnaire

July 7, 1971

Dear Colleague:

I am engaged in research on a doctoral dissertation on the function of the library in theological education. A portion of this will be devoted to present policies and philosophies within the member schools of AATS. Your completion of the attached questionnaire will facilitate this study. If you wish a copy of the summary of my findings, check here._____

The material related to specific institutions will be treated as confidential, unless it is commonly known or is complimentary.

Questionnaires are being sent to the presidents, academic deans, and librarians of AATS member and associate schools. The questionnaires to presidents and deans include only the first part of the questionnaire.

What, in your opinion, should be the function of the library in theological education?

A passive repository of books _____
An aggressive, integral part of the education process_____
A full partner in education for ministry _____
A center for learning resources, including both book and nonbook media _____
Other _____
Would you please state your philosophy of the library's function in theological education? _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

What should be the function of the faculty library committee? _____
_____
_____
_____

What should be the function of the librarian in theological education?

A manager of educational resources _____
An educator, whose specific function is to manage learning resources _____
Other (specify) _____

Cont'd. Page 2
July 7, 1971

Would you state your philosophy of the librarian's function in theological education? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Does your institution have a job description for the librarian? _____
If so, would you please describe it in the following spaces? _____

_____

_____

If you have a written job description, would you share a copy with me?
_____

Does your librarian hold faculty status? _____ Why? _____

_____

Does the librarian function as part of the administrative council of your school (President, dean, other chief administrative officers)? _____

Is the librarian a member of the curriculum committee? _____

To whom is he responsible? President _____ Dean _____
Other (Specify) _____

Is his counsel sought in the planning of new programs and courses? _____

*Does he have full administrative responsibility for the library? _____
Does this include your audio-visual materials and equipment? _____

Describe the relation of media to the library
Audio-visual center apart from the library _____
Complete media services department within the library on a par with readers services and technical services _____
Media integrated in the library collection and administered by the library staff _____
Other (specify) _____

Do you have a budgeted amount for media? _____
Is it part of the library budget? _____

Do you have special or extensive collections of nonbook media? _____
Describe _____

_____

To whom are the nonbook media available? Faculty _____ Staff _____
Students _____ Interlibrary loan _____ Other (specify) _____

Is your instructional staff encouraged to use media in their teaching?
_____ How? _____

Cont'd. Page 3
July 7, 1971

Do you have workers with special training who administer the media and equipment? _____

Could you list for me your equipment?
Audio (record, tape players, etc.) _____
Visuals (films, filmstrip, slide,etc. projectors) _____
Video (VTR, EVR, etc.) _____
How are these related to the library? _____
_____

Would you list your holdings?
Audio
Disk recordings
Tapes
Cassettes
Other _____

Visuals
Films
Filmstrips
Slides
Film loops
Other _____

Video
VTR Tapes _____
Other _____

Please fill in the following statistics
School enrollment _____
Library budget _____
Library holdings _____
Percentage library budget to total institutional budget _____

Check type of library
Independent private _____
University-related _____
Member of a cluster _____
Affiliated with a cooperative group _____
Other (specify) _____

Would you please describe the process by which you came to your present position (i.e. a professor who was asked to become librarian; after working in the library as a student, you decided to follow library work as a career) _____
_____
_____

Thank you for your assistance. You will play a part in any contribution the dissertation will make to theological education and librarianship.

Cont'd. Page 4
July 7, 1971

Sincerely,

G. Paul Hamm
Librarian and Graduate Student (S.T.D.)

jc

* The questionnaire sent presidents and deans included only the material to here, including this question and the salutation at the end.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Monographs

Abbott, Walter M. (ed.). *Documents of Vatican II*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

Adams, Harlen Martin. *The Junior College Library Program: A Study of Library Services in Relation to Instructional Procedures*. Chicago: American Library Association, and Stanford University Press, 1940.

Allen, K. W. *Use of Community College Libraries*. Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet Books, 1971.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. *A Proposal for the Revision of the Pre-Service Professional Component of a Program of Teacher Education*. Washington, D.C., 1964.

American Association of School Librarians and the Department of Audio-visual Instruction of the National Education Association. *Standards for School Media Programs*. Chicago: ALA, 1969.

American Association of Theological Schools. *Salaries in Theological Schools*. Dayton: AATS, 1962.

_____. *Salaries of Instructional Staff and Library Staff in Theological Schools*. Dayton: AATS, 1964.

_____. *A Statistical Profile of the Theological Libraries of AATS Schools*. Dayton: AATS, [1965?].

_____. *Draft of Report of the Committee to Revise Standards and Procedures for Accrediting*. Dayton: AATS, 1971.

_____. *Revised Report of the Committee to Revise Standards and Procedures for Accrediting*. Dayton: AATS, 1972.

American Library Association, Division of Library Statistics. *Library Statistics of College and Universities, 1956-66, Institutional Data*. Chicago: ALA, 1967.

American Theological Library Association. Committee on Library Standards. *Report*. ATLA, 1952.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Audio-Visual Committee. *Guidelines for Audio-Visual Service in Academic Libraries*. Chicago: ALA, 1968.

Aydelotte, Frank. *Breaking the Academic Lock Step*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.

Babin, Pierre. *The Audio-Visual Man*. Dayton: Pflaum, 1970.

Barry, Frank Russell. *Asking the Right Questions: Church and Ministry*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960.

Baskin, Samuel (ed.). *Higher Education: Some New Developments*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Becker, Ernest. *Beyond Alienation: A Philosophy of Education for the Crisis of Democracy*. New York: George Braziller, 1967.

Bergen, Dan, and E. D. Duryea. *Libraries and the College Climate of Learning*. Syracuse: Syracuse University, 1964.

Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Bramlette, W. Howard. *The Higher Education Sieve*. Nashville: Sunday School Board, SBC, 1965.

Branscomb, Harvie. *Teaching With Books*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1940.

Bridston, Keith R., and Dwight W. Culver (eds.). *The Making of Ministers, Essays on Clergy Training Today*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964.

_____. *Pre-seminary Education; Report of the Lilly Endowment Study*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965.

Brown, James, and Kenneth D. Norberg. *Administering Educational Media*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Bruner, Jerome T. *Toward A Theory of Instruction*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967.

Buck, Paul. *Libraries and Universities*. Cambridge: The Belnap Press of Harvard University, 1964.

Coburn, John B. *Minister, Man in the Middle*. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Cogan, Morris L., and others. *Educational Communication Services as a Field of Graduate Study and Research*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University, 1965.

Commission on Instructional Technology. *To Improve Learning: A Report to the President and the Congress of the United States*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March, 1970.

Coney, Donald, Newton F. McKeon, Jr., and Bennett Harvie Branscomb. *The Place of the Library in a University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Library, 1950.

Cox, N. S. M., J. D. Dews, and J. L. Dolby. *The Computer and the Library*. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon, 1967.

Craven, Olga, Alden L. Todd, and Jesse H. Ziegler (eds.). *Theological Education as Professional Education*. Dayton: AATS, 1969.

Davidson, Raymond L. *Audiovisual Machines*. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1969.

Dober, Richard P. *The New Campus in Britain: Ideas of Consequence for the United States*. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1965.

Dubin, Robert, and Thomas C. Taveggia. *The Teaching-Learning Paradox*. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968.

Dupuy, T. N. *Ferment in College Libraries: The Impact of Information Technology*. Report to the Trustees of the College of the Potomac. Washington D.C.: Communication Service Corporation, 1968.

_____. *Modern Libraries for Modern Colleges: Strategies for Research, Design and Development.* Washington: Communication Service Corporation, 1968.

Edling, J. V., and C. A. Paulson. *Understanding Instructional Media. The contribution of behavioral science to instructional technology.* mouth, Oregon: Teaching Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education, n.d.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *The Impact of Technology on the Library Building.* New York, 1967.

Elliott, L. R. *Changing Patterns in Theological Education from Royce to Bultmann.* Fort Worth: Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1962.

Ellsworth, Ralph E. *The School Library.* New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.

Ellul, Jacques. *The Technological Society.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964.

Emerick, Ralph S. "The Librarian Views the Instructional Media Facilities." *Junior College Libraries: Development, Needs, and Perspectives*, ed., Everett L. Moore. Chicago: ALA, 1969, pp. 99-104.

Essays in Ministry. Princeton: Fund for Theological Education, 1967.

Eurich, Alvin C. (ed.). *Campus 1980.* New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

Faegre, Christopher L., and others. *Analysis and Evaluation of Present and Future Multi-media Needs in Higher Education.* Silver Springs: American Institutes of Research, 1968.

Feilding, Charles R. *Education for Ministry.* Dayton: AATS, 1966.

Frazier, Alexander (ed.). *New Insights and the Curriculum.* Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1963.

Gardner, John W. *Self-renewal; the Individual and the Innovative Society.* New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Gleason, Gerald T. (ed.). *The Theory and Nature of Independent Learning.* Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1967.

Goudeau, J. N., and others. *Impact of the Academic Library on the Educational Program.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1967.

Gunselman, Marshall (ed.). *What Are We Learning About Learning Centers?* Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Christian College, 1971.

Hudnut, Robert K. *Surprised by God.* New York: Association Press, 1967.

Haney, John B., and Eldon H. Ullmer. *Educational Media and the Teacher.* Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1970.

Hartshorne, Hugh, and Milton C. Froyd. *Theological Education in the Northern Baptist Convention.* Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1945.

Hessel, Alfred. *History of Libraries*, trans. Reuben Peiss. New Brunswick: Scarecrow Press, 1955.

Hicks, Warren, and Tillin. *Developing Multi-media Libraries.* New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1970.

Jacob, Philip E. *Changing Values in College.* New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

James, Henry Thomas. *The Schools and the Challenge of Innovation.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Johnson, B. Lamar. *Vitalizing a College Library.* Chicago: ALA, 1939.

_____. *Islands of Innovation: Expanding Changes in the Community College.* New York: Gencol Press (Crowell, Collier, Macmillan), 1969.

Johnson, B. Lamar, and Eloise Lindstrom (eds.). *The Librarian and the Teacher in General Education.* Chicago: American Library Association, 1948.

Johnson, Elmer. *History of Libraries in the Western World.* New Brunswick: Scarecrow Press, 1965.

Keller, James (ed.). *Apostolic Renewal in the Seminary.* New York: Christopher Movement, 1965.

Kelly, Robert L. *Theological Education in America; A Study of One Hundred Sixty-One Theological Schools in the United States and Canada.* New York: Doran, 1924.

Kemery, John G. "A Library for 2,000 A.D." In *Management and the Computer of the Future,* ed. Martin Greenberger. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press and New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1968.

Knight, Douglas M., and E. Shepley Norse (eds.). *Libraries at Large: Tradition, Innovation, and the National Interest.* New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1969.

Kohn, Herman, and Anthony J. Wiener. *The Year 2,000: A Framework for Speculation on the Next Thirty-Three Years.* New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Kontos, Peter G., and James J. Murphy (eds.). *Teaching Urban Youths.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Lee, C. Loran. *The Changing Role of the Library on the Junior College Campus--A Case Study at Mt. San Jacinto College.* Paper presented to Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, University of California at Los Angeles, ERIC, March, 1967.

Lee, James M., and Louis J. Putz. *Seminary Education in a Time of Change.* Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, 1965.

Leonard, George B. *Education and Ecstasy.* New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

Library Technology and Architecture. Report of a conference held at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, February 9, 1967. Cambridge: Library, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1968.

Licklider, J. C. R. *Libraries of the Future.* Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1965.

Lyle, Guy Redvers, and others. *The Administration of the College Library*. 3d ed. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1961.

_____. *The President, the Professor and the College Library*. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1963.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Mager, Robert F. *Preparing Instructional Objectives*. Palo Alto: Fearon Publishers, 1962.

_____. *Developing Attitude Toward Learning*. San Francisco: Fearon Publishers, 1968.

The Making of Ministers: Essays on Clergy Training Today. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964.

Markuson, Barbara Evans. *Libraries and Automation*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1964.

Marshall, John David. *An American Library History Reader*. Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1961.

_____. *Of, By and For Librarians*. Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1960.

Maxfield, David K. *Counselor Librarianship: A New Departure*. Urbana: University of Illinois Library School, 1954.

May, Mark A. (ed.). *The Education of American Ministers*. 4 vols. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934.

Mayhew, Lewis. *Student and the Curriculum*. Berkeley: Center for Higher Education, 1970.

Meiklejohn, Alexander. *The Experimental College*. New York: Harper and Row, 1932.

Melby, Ernest O. *The Teacher and Learning*. Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.

Menne, John W., and others. *The Feasibility of Using Taped Lectures to Replace Class Attendance*. A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, Los Angeles, February 6, 1969. Bethesda, Maryland: Educational Resources Information Center, 1969.

Metcalf, Keyes. *Planning Academic and Research Library Buildings*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Mitzel, Harold E. *The Impending Instructional Revolution*. Bethesda, Maryland: Educational Resources Information Center, 1970.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. *The Puritan Pronaos*. New York: New York University Press, 1936.

Morris, Van Cleve. *Existentialism in Education: What It Means*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Morrison, Perry D. *The Career of the Academic Librarian*. Chicago: ALA, 1969.

Moss, Basil S. *Clergy Training Today*. London: SPCK, 1964.

Nash, Paul. *Authority and Freedom in Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Neagley, Ross L., N. Dean Evans, and Clarence A. Lynn, Jr. *The School Administrator and Learning Resources*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Newman, Frank, and others. *Report on Higher Education, March, 1971*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. *The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry; Reflections on the Aims of Theological Education*. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

Niebuhr, H. Richard, and Daniel D. Williams (eds.). *The Ministry in Historical Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

Niebuhr, H. Richard, Daniel Day Williams, and James M. Gustafson. *The Advancement of Theological Education*. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Ortega y Gasset, José. *The Mission of the Librarian*. Boston: G. K. Hall and Co., 1961.

Overhage, Carl F. J., and R. Joyce Harman (eds.). *Intrex*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1965.

Patterson, Franklin, and Charles R. Longworth. *The Making of a College*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1966.

Pearson, Neville P., and Lucius Butler. *Instructional Materials Centers: Selected Readings*. Minneapolis: Burgess, 1969.

Poole, Stafford. *Seminary in Crisis*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.

Postlethwait, S. N., and others. *An Integrated Experience Approach to Learning, with Emphasis on Independent Study*. Minneapolis: Burgess, 1964.

Predeek, Albert. *History of Libraries in Great Britain and North America*, trans., Lawrence S. Thompson. Chicago: ALA, 1947.

Pula, Fred John. *Application and Operation of Audio-Visual Equipment in Education*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.

Pusey, Nathan M., and Charles L. Taylor. *Ministry for Tomorrow*. New York: Seabury Press, 1967.

Raushenbush, Esther. *The Student and His Studies*. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University, 1964.

Renfield, Richard. *If Teachers Were Free*. Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1969.

Renssalaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York, Center for Architectural Research. *Educational Facilities with New Media*, eds., Alan C. Green and others. Washington: Dept. of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association, 1966.

Rogers, Carl Ronsom. *On Becoming a Person: A Therapists's View of Psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Sanford, Nevitt. *The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Learning*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Schaefer, Robert J. *The School as a Center of Inquiry*. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Shores, Louis. *Library-College, U.S.A.* Tallahassee: South Pass Press, 1970.

_____. *Mark Hopkins' Log and Other Essays*. Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1965.

Siegel, Laurence (ed.). *Instruction: Some Contemporary Viewpoints*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967.

Smith, Elmer. *Teacher Education: A Reappraisal*. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Smith, Robert E. *A Review of Published and Unpublished Material Concerning College and University Learning Resource Centers*. Champaign, Illinois: Richardson, Severns, Scheeler & Associates, 1965.

Snyder, Luella. *The Second Kind of Knowledge: A Special Library Report to the Coordinator and Directors of Project One of the Inter-University Program in Teacher Education on the Use of Library Resources by University Students*. Syracuse: Syracuse University, 1964.

Snygg, Donald, and Arthur W. Combs. *Individual Behavior: A Perceptual Approach to Behavior*. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.

Solmon, Stephen R. *Library Automation: A State of the Art Review*. Chicago: ALA, 1969.

Stickler, Hugh (ed.). *Experimental Colleges*. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1964.

Tead, Ordway. *The Climate of Learning: A Constructive Attack on Complacency in Higher Education*. New York: Harper and Row, 1958.

Thompson, James J. *Instructional Communication*. New York: American Book Co., 1969.

Thornton, James W., and James W. Brown (eds.). *New Media and College Teaching*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1968.

Toffler, Alvin. *Future Shock*. New York: Random House, 1970.

Trow, William Clark. *Teacher and Technology*. New York: Meredith Publishing Co., 1963.

Tyler, Ralph W. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Underwood, Kenneth. *The Church, the University and Social Policy* Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1969.

Wagoner, Walter D. *Bachelor of Divinity*. New York: Association Press, 1963.

_____. *The Seminary: Protestant and Catholic*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.

Welch, Claude. *Graduate Education in Religion: A Critical Appraisal*. Missoula: University of Montana Press, 1971.

Wasserman, Paul. *The Librarian and the Machine*. Detroit: Gale, 1965.

Watson, Goodwin. *Change in School Systems*. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, NEA, 1967.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *The Aims of Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1929.

Wilson, J. Christy (ed.). *Ministers in Training*. Princeton: Directors of Field Work in the Theological Seminaries of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., 1957.

Wilson, Louis Round. *The Library in College Instruction*. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1951.

Wright, Louis B. *Culture on the Moving Frontier*. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

Wriston, Henry M. *The Nature of a Liberal College*. Appleton, Wisconsin: Lawrence College Press, 1937.

2. Serials

"The Academic Library as an Instrument of Learning: a Symposium by a panel consisting of Harvie Branscomb, B. Lamar Johnson, Hilton C. Buley, Stafford North, John E. Tirrell, Woodburn O. Ross, Dan J. Sillers," *Library-College Journal*, 1:12-40, Fall, 1968.

Ahlers, Eleanor E., and Perry D. Morrison. "The Materials Center at the School District Level," *Library Trends*, 16:446, April, 1968.

Alexander, Elenora. "The IMS Merger," *Library Journal*, 89:115-117, October 15, 1964.

Alexander, James E. "New Formulas for Theological Education," *Religion in Life*, 35:30-34, Winter, 1965-66.

"Alternatives to the System in Education," *Saturday Review*, June 20, 1970, pp. 71-90.

American Association of Theological Schools. *Bulletin 9*. Dayton: AATS, 1934.

_____. *Bulletin 11*. Dayton: AATS, 1934.

_____. *Bulletin 13*. Dayton: AATS, 1938.

_____. *Bulletin 17*. Dayton: AATS, 1946.

_____. *Bulletin 18*. Dayton: AATS, 1948.

_____. *Bulletin 20*. Dayton: AATS, 1952.

_____. *Bulletin 22*. Dayton: AATS, 1956.

_____. *Bulletin of Information*. Dayton: AATS, 1956.

_____. *Bulletin 23*. Dayton: AATS, 1958

_____. *Monthly Staff Report and Bulletin of Information.* Dayton: AATS, 1960.

_____. *Bulletin 27.* Dayton: AATS, 1966.

_____. *Salaries in AATS Schools: A Biennial Report.* Dayton: AATS, 1966.

_____. *Bulletin 28.* Dayton: AATS, 1968.

American Theological Library Association. *Summary of Proceedings. First Annual Conference.* ATLA, 1947.

_____. *Summary of Proceedings, Third Annual Conference.* ATLA, 1949.

_____. *Summary of Proceedings, Fourth Annual Conference.* ATLA, 1950.

_____. *Summary of Proceedings, Fifth Annual Conference.* ATLA, 1951.

_____. *Summary of Proceedings, Seventh Annual Conference.* ATLA, 1953.

_____. *Summary of Proceedings, Fifteenth Annual Conference,* ATLA, 1961.

_____. *Summary of Proceedings, Twentieth Annual Conference,* ATLA, 1966.

_____. *Summary of Proceedings, Twenty-first Annual Conference.* ATLA, 1967.

Association for Professional Education for Ministry. *Shaping the Ministry for the 70's; Eleventh Biennial Report,* ed., John Romig Johnson, Jr. Claremont: Association for Professional Education for Ministry, 1970.

Association of Seminary Professors in the Practical Fields. *Tenth Biennial Report.* Nashville: Association of Seminary Professors in the Practical Fields, 1968.

Astin, Alexander W. "Are the 'Best Colleges' Really Better?" *Think,* 36: 26-28, September-October, 1970.

Atkinson, Ralph, "Creating Facilities for New Educational Systems," *Library-College Journal,* 4:42-47, Summer, 1971.

"Audio Center for the College of San Mateo," *American School and University,* 36:27, July, 1964.

"Automation in University Libraries--the State of the Art." *Library Resources & Technical Services,* 13:520-530, Fall, 1969.

Balanoff, Neal. "James M. Wood Listening Center: A Saturation Experiment at Stephens College," *Audio Visual Instruction,* 8:226-229, April, 1963.

Barnett, Abraham N. "The Professor and the Librarian," *Liberal Education,* 45:242-248, May, 1959.

"Basic Concepts of the Role of the Library in College Instruction," *Drexel Library Quarterly,* 7:173, July and October, 1971.

Baskin, Samuel. *Quest for Quality.* New Dimensions of Higher Education, No. 7. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1960.

Beach, Robert F. "Protestant Theological Seminaries and Their Libraries," *Library Trends,* 2:131-148, October, 1960.

Becker, Joseph. "Tomorrow's Library Services Today," *News Notes of California Libraries,* 63:429-440, Fall, 1968.

Bennett, John C. "Priorities in Theological Education," *Christianity and Crisis*, 29:87-90, April 14, 1969.

Bergen, D. P. "Librarians and the Bi-Polarization of the Academic Enterprise," *College and Research Libraries*, 24:467-480, November, 1963.

Bergeson, Clarence O. "Relationship of Library Science and Audio-Visual Instruction," *Audiovisual Instruction*, 12:100-103, February, 1967.

Bessie, Simon Michael. "Quality or Survival? or Both?" *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 43:22-29, September, 1968.

Beswick, Norman W. "Library-College: The True University," *Library Association Record*, 69:198-202, June, 1967.

_____. "Librarians and Tutor-Librarians," *Library-College Journal*, Spring, 1969.

Bevan, John M. "The Interim Term: Its History, and Modus Operandi," *Library-College Journal*, 2:11-24, Summer, 1969.

Biermann, June. "A Half Million Dollars' Worth of Experience," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 36:152-154, October, 1961.

Blackburn, Robert. "College Libraries--Paradoxical Failures," *Library-College Journal*, 1:18-62, Winter, 1968.

Blake, Fay M. "The Library-College Movement," *Drexel Library Quarterly, 7:175-201*, July and October, 1971.

Blumenfeld, Catherine, and Robert Jordan. "The Federal City College Media Center," *Library-College Journal*, 1:31-39, Spring, 1968.

Boaz, Martha, "Some Current Concepts about Library Education," *College and Research Libraries*, 33:18-23, January, 1972.

Bolvin, Boyd M. "Libraries of the Future--a Multimedia Presentation," *News Notes of California Libraries*, 63:395-404, Fall, 1968.

Boshears, Onva, and Gary E. Strong. "The Residence Hall Library," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 42:829-836, April, 1968.

Branscomb, Bennett Harvie. "Curing the Campus Coronary," *Library-College Journal*, 1:13-16, Fall, 1968.

Brown, Terry P. "Shortage of Preachers Turns Into a Surplus and Creates Hardships," *Wall Street Journal*, February 16, 1971.

Bruggink, D. J. "The Historical Background of Theological Education," *Reformed Review*, 19:2-17, May, 1966.

Bruner, Jerome S. "Learning and Thinking," *Harvard Educational Review*, 29:184-192, Summer, 1959.

Buehler, Donald G. "How to Help Your Teachers Use the New Media," *The Nations Schools*, July, 1962, p. 41.

Buley, Hilton C. "The Critical Mass in Library Dynamics," *Library-College Journal*, 1:22-24, Fall, 1968.

Bundy, Mary Lee. "Libraries, Manpower, and Automation: Shaping the Future of Libraries," *Library Trends*, 18:464-477, April, 1970.

Burdin, Joel L. "Chronology 1971: Events and Conditions of Most Significance to the Educational Community," *ERIC News*, 4:1-4, January, 1972.

Burget, Robert H. "Instructional Materials Center--Innovation, Motivation, Cooperation," *Scholastic Teacher*, February 3, 1967.

Chalmers, John J. "Audiovisual In-Service Training," *Audiovisual Instruction*, May, 1970, pp. 60-63.

"The Changing Role of the Teacher," *Educational Technology*, February, 1970.

Chen, Wen Chao, "A Sound Library Service for the Small College," *Liberal Education*, 46:233-240, May, 1960.

Chickering, Arthur W. "Dimensions of Independence," *The Journal of Higher Education*, 35:38-41, January, 1965.

Clapp, Verner W. *The Future of the Research Library*. Phineas L. Windsor Series in Librarianship, No. 8. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964.

Cleaves, Paul D. "Coordinated AV: Weymouth Instructional Materials Center," *Grade Teacher*, June, 1964, pp. 11-19, 64-75.

Cole, Charles C. and Lanora G. Lewis. *Flexibility in the Undergraduate Curriculum*. New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 11. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1960.

Come, Arnold B. "Discussion: The Seminary in Ten Years," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, 22:339-343, May, 1967.

Commager, Henry Steele. "The Crisis of the Academic Library," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 43:518-529, February, 1969.

Conference of Eastern College Librarians. *Library-instructional Integration on the College Level; Report of the 40th Conference of Eastern College Librarians, Held at Columbia University, November 27, 1954*. Chicago: Association of College and Reference Libraries, 1955.

Congreve, Willard J. "Learning Center...Catalyst for Change?" *Educational Leadership*, 21:211-213, January, 1964.

Crossman, David M. "The Remote Access Audio/Video Information Systems," *Library Trends*, 19:438, April, 1971.

Cumming, William Kenneth. "The Learning Center at Brevard Junior College," *Audio Visual Instruction*, 12:793-797, October, 1967.

"Curriculum for the 70's," *Phi Delta Kappan*, March, 1970.

Dane, Chase. "The School Library as an Instructional Materials Center," *Peabody Journal of Education*, September, 1963, pp. 81-85.

Davidson, Glen W. "The Library Versus the Streets?" *Theological Education*, 61:15-20, Autumn, 1969.

Davis, John A. "What About the Media Administrator?" *Peabody Journal of Education*, 43:238, January, 1966.

Deering, Ronald F. "Library Service in the Theological Seminary Today and Tomorrow," *Review and Expositor*, 65:209-220, Spring, 1968.

"Designing Curriculum in a Changing Society, Part 1," *Educational Technology*, April, 1970.

"Designing Curriculum in a Changing Society, Part 2," *Educational Technology*, May, 1970.

Diener, Ronald C. "Pooling of Resources and Bibliographic Control," *Theological Education*, 6:52-58, Autumn, 1969.

Dix, William S. "The Librarian of the Uncertain Future," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 43:39-40, September, 1968.

Drexel Library-College Conference (Philadelphia, 1966). "Proceedings," *Drexel Library Quarterly*, 4:1-2, 1968.

Driver, Tom F. "Seminary Education: New Purpose-in-Being," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, 22:297-305, May, 1967.

Dubester, Henry J. "Issues and Problems in Designing a National Program of Library Automation," *Library Trends*, 18:427-578, April, 1970.

Eatough, C. L. "What Tomorrow's Library Will Look Like," *Nation's Schools*, 77:107-109, March, 1966.

Ely, Donald P. (ed.). "Functions of Personnel Within the Field," *AV Communication Review*, January-February, 1963, pp. 27-30.

_____. "The Contemporary College Library: Change by Evolution or Revolution," *Libraries and Educational Technology Newsletter*, July 6, 1971.

Eurich, Alvin C. "Higher Education in the 21st Century," *Atlantic*, 211: 51-55, June, 1963.

_____. "The Commitment to Experiment and Innovate in College Teaching," *Educational Record*, 45:49-55, Winter, 1964.

Faris, Gene. "Would You Believe an Instructional Developer?" *Audiovisual Instruction*, 13:971-973, November, 1968.

Feilding, Derek. "American Automation Updated," *Library Journal*, 94:2881-85, September 1, 1969.

Forman, Sidney. "Innovative Practices in College Libraries," *College and Research Libraries*, 29:486-492, November, 1968.

Frazier, Alexander. "Open Learning and the School Librarian," *ALA Bulletin*, 54, February, 1960.

Frederick, Franz J. "Overview of Current Learning Theories for Media Centers," *Library Trends*, 19:401-406, April, 1971

Gapp, Kenneth S. "Current Trends in Theological Libraries," *Library Trends*, 9:194-200, October, 1960.

Gardner, Dwayne E. "Educational Specifications for the School Library," *ALA Bulletin*, 58:114-115, February, 1964.

Gardner, John W. "Education as a Way of Life," *Science*, 148:759, May 7, 1965.

Gaver, Mary V. "The Librarian in the Academic Community--a New Breed?", *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 43:540-545, February, 1969.

Gaver, Mary V. and Milbrey L. Jones. "Secondary Library Services: A Search for Essentials," *Teachers College Record,* Columbia University, December, 1966, pp. 200-210.

Gaylor, Robert. "The Philosophy of the Last Frontier, *The Library-College Journal,* 2:35-40, Summer, 1969.

Geller, Evelyn, "This Matter of Media," *Library Journal,* 96:2048-2053, June 15, 1971.

Gerlach, Vernon S. "The Professional Education of the Media Specialist," *Audiovisual Communications Review,* Summer, 1966, pp. 185-201.

Giles, Louise. "Planning Community College Resource Centers," *American Libraries,* 2:51-54, January, 1971.

Goen, C. C. "Changing Conceptions of Protestant Theological Education in America," *Foundations: A Baptist Journal of History and Theology,* 6:293-310, January, 1963.

Goff, R. and P. J. Sleeman. "Instructional Materials Center: Dialogue or Discord?" *AV Communications Review,* 15:160, Summer, 1967.

Golterman, S. I. "Future of Theological Education," *Concordia Theological Monthly,* 39:597-606, October, 1968.

Gooler, Dennis D. "Abstract of Some Thoughts on the Future and Instructional Technology," *Media Manpower,* 3:13, November, 1971.

Goudeau, John M. "Islands of Innovation," *Library-College Journal,* 2:41-51, Summer, 1969.

Graham, Mae (ed.). "The Changing Nature of the School Library," *Library Trends,* 17:343-447, April, 1969.

Grazier, Margaret Hayes. "What Happens in the School Library," *ALA Bulletin,* 58:104-108, February, 1964.

Green, Garrett, "Theological Education," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review,* 22:293-294, May, 1967.

Griffin, Marjorie, "The Library of Tomorrow," *Library Journal,* 87:1555-1557, April 15, 1962.

Grose, M. W. "The Place of the Librarian in the Computer Age," *Library Association Record,* 70:195-197, August, 1968.

Grossman, Maria. "Theological Libraries: Center or Periphery?" *Theological Education,* 5:125-127, Winter, 1969.

Grouix, Harry J. "An Elementary Library Is Not Enough," *Michigan Education Journal,* February, 1963, p. 454.

Gwynn, Stanley E. "The Liberal Arts Function of the University Library," *Library Quarterly,* 24:316, October, 1954.

Haas, Warren J. "The Role of the Building Consultant," *College and Research Libraries,* 30:365-68, July, 1969.

Harvey, John F. "Building and Equipment Trends," *Library Trends, 14: 203-208, October, 1965.*

Hatch, Winslow and Alice L. Richards. *Approach to Independent Study*, New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 13. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1965.

Haywood, C. Robert. "Old, Bold Librarians," *Library-College Journal*, 1:11-14, Summer, 1968.

Henne, Frances. "Standards for School Library Services at the District Level," *Library Trends*, 16:502, April, 1968.

Hicks, Warren B. "Center of the Campus: Chabot College Library." *Junior College Journal*, 37:38-40, November, 1966.

_____. "Chabot Rounds Out Resources," *Library Journal*, 91:5897-5901, December 1, 1966.

Hinchliff, William. "Urban Problems and Higher Education," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 43:527-533, February, 1969.

Huseman, Dwight A. "Books, Periodicals, and the Pastor," *Drexel Library Quarterly*, 6:4-27, January, 1970.

Jackson, Benjamin Franklin (ed.). *Audiovisual Facilities and Equipment for Churchmen*. Communication for Churchmen Series, vol. 3. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.

Janssen, Peter. "St. John's College of Annapolis," *American Education*, 2:13, October, 1966.

Jay, C. Douglas. "Change, Relevance, and Theological Librarianship," *Theological Education*, 6:7-14, Autumn, 1969.

Johnson, B. Lamar. "The Heart of the College: A Commitment and Action," *Library-College Journal*, 1:17-21, Fall, 1968.

Johnson, Frances Kennon and Cora Paul Bomar (ed.). "Case Studies in School Library Planning," *ALA Bulletin*, 2:116-122, February, 1964.

_____. "Planning School Library Quarters," *ALA Bulletin*, 2:103, February, 1964.

Johnson, Marvin R. A. "How the Architect Works," *ALA Bulletin*, 2:109-111, February, 1964.

_____. "The High School Library--A Service and A Place," *The High School Journal*, November, 1966, pp. 91-95.

Johnson, Ted. "Dial, Remote and Random," *ALA Bulletin*, 62:1085-1088, October, 1968.

Jones, R. C. "Multicampus Instructional Resources," *Junior College Journal*, March, 1966.

Jordan, Robert T., and others. *Impact of the Academic Library on the Educational Program*. New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 29. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1967.

Jordan, Robert T. "Libraries of the Future for the Liberal Arts College." *Library Journal*, 92:537-539, February 1, 1967.

Josey, E. J. "The Feasibility of Establishing a Library-College in Predominantly Negro Colleges," *Library-College Journal*, 1:22-37, Winter 1968.

Kaufman, Ruth A. "Design in the Library," *Library-College Journal*, 2:25-34, Summer, 1969.

Kelley, Gaylen B. "A Study of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Audiovisual Materials," *Educational Screen and Audiovisual Guide*, March, 1960, p. 119.

Kemp, Jerrold. "Implementing Our Professional Role," *Audiovisual Instruction*, 14:25-28, January, 1969.

Kennedy, James R., Jr., and others. "Course-related Library Instruction: A Case Study of the English and Biology Departments at Earlham College," *Drexel Library Quarterly*, 7:277-297, July and October, 1971.

Kerr, Hugh T. "Education in General and Theological Education," *Theology Today*, 27:434-452, January, 1971.

_____. "Seminarians and Self-directed Study," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, 64:69-76, March, 1971.

Kister, Kenneth F. "A View from the Front," *Library Journal*, 96:3283-3286, October 15, 1971.

Klemt, Calvin C. "AATS Educational Techniques and Seminary Libraries," *Theological Education*, 5:357-364, Summer, 1969.

Knade, Oscar. "A Library Is to Serve," *Elementary English*, March, 1964, p. 289.

Knapp, Patricia B. "Suggested Program of College Instruction in the Use of the Library," *Library Quarterly*, 27:224-231, July, 1956.

_____. *Independent Study and the Academic Library. An Approach to Independent Study*. New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 13. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1965.

Konick, Marcus, and Benjamin Jenkins. "The Regional Instructional Materials Center in Pennsylvania," *Audiovisual Instruction*, September, 1966, pp. 554-557.

Lake Okoboji Educational Media Leadership Conference, 13th, 1967. *Summary Report*. Iowa City: Audio-Visual Center of the University of Iowa, 1967.

Lake Okoboji Educational Media Leadership Conference, 16th, 1970. *Summary Report*. Iowa City: Audio-Visual Center of the University of Iowa, 1970.

Lane, Gorham. "Assessing the Undergraduates' Use of the University Library," *College and Research Libraries*, 27:227-283, July, 1966.

Leonard, H. V., comp. "Selected Bibliography on Theological Education," *Duke Divinity School Review*, 33:54-55, Winter, 1968.

Leuba, Clarence J. "Thoughts on an Ideal College," *The Library-College Journal*, 1:38-49, Winter, 1968.

Lewis, Lanora, Ned J. Bryan, and Robert Poppendieck. *Talent and Tomorrow's Teachers: The Honors Approach*, New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 11. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1963.

Lewis, Philip (ed.). "New Dimensions in Educational Technology for Multimedia Centers," *Library Trends*, 19:399-523, April, 1971.

"Libraries of the Future," *Law and Library Journal*, 60:379-397, November, 1967.

"Library-College Land: A Puzzlement," *Library Journal*, 96:935, March 15, 1971.

"The Library of the Future: A WLB Symposium," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 39:228-243, November, 1964.

Lienemann, William, and June Sochen. "The Little College Within a Large College," *The Journal of Higher Education*, 40:389-393, May, 1969.

Lorenz, John and Peter Muirhead. "The Campus Library," *American Education*, 1:12-19, May, 1965.

Lunham, Richard. "Marian the Technologist?" *SDC Magazine*, 11:2-9, November, 1968.

McInnis, Noel E. "Vice-President in Charge of Heresy: A Fresh Approach to Self Study," *Library-College Journal*, 2:24-28, Spring, 1969.

McMahan, Marie. "Educational Media Center--The Library's New Look," *American Annals of the Deaf*, April, 1967.

Mager, Robert F. "The Instructional Technologist," *Educational Technology*, 7:1-4, May, 1967.

Mann, Robert F. "The Bottomless Pit, or the Academic Library as Viewed from the Administration Building," *College and Research Libraries*, 290:51-54, January, 1968.

Marchant, Maurice P. "Faculty-Librarian Conflict," *Library Journal*, 94:2886-2889, September 1, 1969.

"Master Plan for Total Library Services," *California Librarian*, 31:108f, April, 1970.

Mehl, Warren R. "The Protestant Theological Library in America: Past, Present, and Future," *Theology and Life*, 7:230-243, Fall, 1964.

Miller, Samuel H. "Education for Insecurity," *The Harvard Divinity Bulletin*, 29:27-34, October, 1964.

Milton, Ohmer. *Teaching or Learning?* Research Report No. 6. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.

Monahan, William G. "The Library: Toward an Escape from the Doctrinaire: Changing Libraries for Changing Schools," *Library-College Journal*, 1:26-31, Summer, 1968.

Morris, Raymond P. "Librarians," *Theological Education*, 1:72, Autumn, 1964.

Mumford, L. Quincy. "Librarians and the Everlasting Now," *Pennsylvania Library Association Bulletin*, 21:57-65, November, 1965.

Munn, Robert F. "The Library-College Movement: A Few Heresies," *Library-College Journal*, 2:26-28, Fall, 1964.

National Conference on the Implications of the New Media for the Teaching of Library Science, ed., Harold Goldstein. Graduate School of Library Science Monograph Series, No. 1. Urbana: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1963.

Nelson, Ervin N. "Establishing and Operating the Audio-Visual Library," *School Board Journal*, April, 1963, p. 22.

North, Stafford. "Putting the Library at the Heart," *Library-College Journal*, 1:25-28, Fall, 1968.

Oettinger, Anthony, and Sema Marks, "Educational Technology: New Myths and Old Realities," *Harvard Educational Review*, 38:697-717, Fall, 1968.

Parker, Ralph H. "The Machine and the Librarian," *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 9:100-103, Winter, 1965.

_____. "The Small Library Faces the Future," *ALA Bulletin*, 61:669-671, June, 1967.

Pearson, Neville P. "Instant Transparencies," *Educational Screen and Audiovisual Guide*, March, 1961, p. 127.

Posner, A. N. "The Instructional Materials Center as a Means for Constructive Use of Teachers' Talents," *California Journal of Secondary Education*, April, 1960, pp. 250-251.

Postlethwait, Samuel N. "Time for Microcourses?" *Library-College Journal*, 2:24-29, Winter, 1969.

Potter, Richard C. "Multi-media: The Side Effect," *Catholic Library World*, 39:327-337, January, 1968.

Preston, Ellinor G. "The Librarian Sees His Role in the Materials Center," *Educational Leadership*, January, 1964, p. 214.

Profet, Karen. "Document Storage and Retrieval," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 43:59-68, September, 1968.

Quinly, William J. "The Selection, Processing, and Storage of Non-Print Materials; Aids, Indexes, and Guidelines," *Library Trends*, 16:274-282, October, 1967.

_____. "Carrells for Learning," *Library Trends*, 19:467-474, April, 1971.

Reece, E. J. "Library Building Programs: How to Draft Them," *College and Research Libraries*, 13:197-211, July, 1952.

Reed, Paul C. "Aids Is Obsolete: An Editorial," *Educational Screen and Audiovisual Guide*, November, 1963, p. 615.

Reid, Chandos. "The Instructional Materials Center--A Service Center for Teachers," *The High School Journal*, November, 1960, pp. 59-65.

Rockwell, William Walker. "Theological Libraries in the United States," *Religion in Life*, 13:545-555, Autumn, 1944.

Rogers, Richard D. "Realization is Another Matter," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 43:41, September, 1968.

Samore, Theodore. "Current Condition of American Academic Libraries," *Higher Education*, 20:7-10, December, 1963.

Schaper, Richard L. "The Challenge of the New Student," *Christianity and Crisis*, 29:91-92, April 14, 1969.

Schofield, Edward T. "Materials Integration: Philosophy of the Future?" *Audiovisual Instruction*, February, 1962, p. 102.

Schuller, D. S. "Theological Education; Crisis and Renewal," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 40:3-12, January, 1969.

_____. "Editorial Introduction," *Theological Education*, 6:5, Autumn, 1969.

Schwilck, G. L. "Million Dollar Carrels," *Library Journal*, 93:306-308, January 15, 1967.

Scott, W. W. "Librarians, Automation, and Undergraduate Education," *Education*, 89:260-263, February-March, 1969.

Seely, Paul H. "The Lecture and Superficial Scholarship," *Theological Education*, 4:619-622, Winter, 1968.

Shaull, Richard. "The Challenge to the Seminary," *Christianity and Crisis*, 29:81-86, April 14, 1969.

Sheehan, Sister Helen. "Implementing the Library-College Idea: Introducing the Library-College through Independent Study," *Library-College Journal*, 1:15-19, Summer, 1968.

Shera, Jesse H. "What Is Past Is Prologue: Beyond 1984," *ALA Bulletin*, 61:35-47, January, 1967.

_____. "Librarians Against Machines," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 42:65-73, September, 1967.

Shoffner, Ralph M. "Economics of National Automation of Libraries," *Library Trends*, 18:448-463, April, 1970.

Shores, Louis. "The Library Arts College: A Possibility in 1954?" *School and Society*, 41:110-114, January 26, 1935.

_____. "The Library Junior College," *Junior College Journal*, 36:6, March, 1966.

_____. "The Medium Way," *Library-College Journal*, 1:10-17, Winter, 1968.

Shores, Louis, and Janiece Fusaro. "Innovations," *Learning Today*, 5:61-66, Winter, 1972.

Silber, Kenneth H. "What Field Are We In, Anyway?" *Audiovisual Instruction*, 15:21-24, May, 1970.

Silberman, Arlene. "They'll Never Stop Learning--Excitement in North Dakota," *Reader's Digest*, 97:209-10, July, 1970.

Sillers, Dan J. "What Library for the Educated Man?" *Library-College Journal*, 1:37-40, Fall, 1968.

_____. "Practical Aspects of the Library-College Idea," *Catholic Library World*, 40:182-184, November, 1968.

Skinner, B. F. "Why Teachers Fail," *Saturday Review*, 48:80-81, 98-102, October 16, 1965.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Snider, Robert C. "The Communications Specialist in the 1960's," *Audiovisual Instruction*, February, 1962, pp. 96-99.

Solomon, Albert E. "AV--Outdated?" *Audiovisual Instruction*, 8:282, April, 1963.

Sommer, Robert, and Peggy Peterson. "Study Carrels Re-examined," *College and Research Libraries*, 28:263-268, July, 1967.

Stickler, W. Hugh. "The Experimental College: Progress, Problems, and Prospects," *Library-College Journal*, 1:17-30, Spring, 1968.

Stone, Walter C. "The Library Function Redefined," *Library Trends*, 16:181-196, October, 1967.

_____ (ed.). "Library Uses of the New Media of Communication," *Library Trends*, 16:179-299, October, 1967.

"Student Opinion Regarding Theological Education," *Theological Education*, 4:601-646, Winter, 1968.

Sutton, Lee. "A Teaching Technique for Library-Centered Courses," *Library-College Journal*, 1:20-25, Summer, 1968.

Swank, Raymond C. "The Educational Function of the University Library," *Library Trends*, 1:49-57, July 1952.

Tang, Emery. "Understanding the Listener as Movie-Goer," *Preaching*, 2:28-31, September-October, 1967.

Tanis, J. R. "Library and Its Role in the Divinity School," *Harvard Divinity Bulletin*, 26:19-22, January, 1962.

Tatum, Michael. "Trouble-free Library Planning and Construction," *American Libraries*, 1:878-883, October, 1970.

Taylor, Robert S. "Toward the Design of a College Library," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 43:44-52, September, 1968.

Theobald, Robert. "Higher Education and Cybernation," *NEA Journal*, 55:26-27, March, 1966.

"Theological Curriculum for the 1970's," *Theological Education*, 4:671-743, Spring, 1968.

"Theological Education," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, 22:297-365, May, 1967.

"Theological Libraries: Assets or Liabilities?" *Theological Education*, 6:5-82, Autumn, 1969.

Tirrell, John E. "Goodbye to the Classroom," *The Library-College Journal*, 1:29-33, Fall, 1968.

Torbet, Robert G. "Baptist Theological Education," *Foundations*, 6:311-335, October, 1963.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *The Commissioner's Annual Report*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971.

U.S. National Communicable Disease Center and U.S. National Institute of Mental Health. *Training Methodology; Part IV: Audiovisual Theory, Aids and Equipment; an Annotated Bibliography*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Vandenberg, Donald. "Experimentalism in the Anesthetic Society: Existential Education," *Harvard Educational Review*, 32:155-182, Spring, 1962.

Veaver, Allen B. "The Application of Computers to Library Technical Processing," *College and Research Libraries*, 31:36-42, January, 1970.

Vickery, B. C. "The Future of Libraries," *The Library Association Record*, 68:252-260, July, 1966.

Vosper, Robert. "The Computer--No Simple Cure," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 43:43, September, 1968.

Vredevoe, L. E., and F. L. Goff. "Is Your School or College Library a Bottleneck?" *Journal of Secondary Education*, 39:279-285, October, 1964.

Waite, David P. "Developing a Library Automation Program," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 43:52-58, September, 1968.

Wartluft, David J. "Cooperative Ventures in Theological Libraries," *Drexel Library Quarterly*, 6:27-44, January, 1970.

Westerhoff, John. "Freeing Ourselves from the Myth Makers," *Colloquy*, 4:5-14, July-August, 1971.

Western College Association. *The Is and the Ought of Higher Education in the Seventies; Addresses and Proceedings, Annual Meeting, 1971*. Oakland: Western College Association, 1971.

Witt, Paul W. F. "High School Libraries as Instructional Materials Centers," *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, November, 1959, pp. 112-118.

Yeast, W. R. "The True University These Days Is a Collection of Books," *The Cornell Library Conference*, ed., G. H. Healey. Ithaca: Cornell University Library, 1964.

Ziegler, Jesse H. "Shaping Education for the Ministry in the 1970's," *Lexington Theological Quarterly*, 6:29-36, April, 1971.

3. Unpublished Works

Boddy, Inez Moore. "The Relationship Between Librarians and Audio-Visual Specialists in Colleges and Universities and the Role of Each in the Academic Process." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1965.

Braden, Irene Andrea. "The Undergraduate Library on the University Campus." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1967.

Carroll, Jackson Walker. "Seminaries and Seminarians: a Study of the Professional Socialization of Protestant Clergymen." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1970.

Connors, Manning Austin. "Curricular Change and Innovation in Selected Church-related Institutions of Higher Education, 1961-1970." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.

Ely, Donald P. "Toward a Philosophy of Instructional Technology." Unpublished paper, Syracuse University, Spring, 1970.

Gray, Elmer Leslie. "The Ministry: Confusion or Competence?" Mill Valley, California: Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

Harris, Ira W. "The Influences of Accessibility on Academic Library Use." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers--The State University, 1966.

Hicks, Warren B. "Educational Specifications for Resource Materials Center." Paper prepared for Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1971.

Jones, Ronald W. "Utilization of the Electronic Media; Audio and Video Tape Recorders." Unpublished report, Concordia Seminary, 1971.

McMahan, Marie E. "A Study of the Feasibility of a System of Pre-Service Teacher Education in Media." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.

Meyer, Donald Paul. "An Investigation of Perceptions Regarding the Instructional Functions of the Library among Faculty Members and Librarians at Public Community Colleges in Michigan." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.

Morris, Raymond Philip. "A Study of the Library Facilities of a Group of Representative Protestant Theological Seminaries in the United States and Canada." Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Library Service, Columbia University, 1932.

Scherer, Henry Howard. "Faculty-Librarian Relations in Selected Liberal Arts Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1960.